

Against Christianity

By Sthenelus Letheus

Introduction

The purpose of this work is to show the christian portion of the right wing that what they praise and devotedly worship is in fact the very thing which has spawned and diligently maintained everything that both they and I truly despise. This is not directed towards more genuine christians, I mean those who have had the doctrines of the faith battered ceaselessly into their skulls from birth, and consequently have little or no care for anything that is “worldly”, that is, anything related to reality, which is what right wingers are concerned with for the most part. Those who have lived consistently as rootless and egalitarian, raised in thoroughly christian homes with absolutely no shred of concern for anything regarding biological or naturalistic realities of human nature will gain nothing from reading this, because while I will not restrain myself from writing passionately, this work ultimately will make no appeals to anything that takes part in the realm of intuitive, irrational, subjective, effeminate, and sensational thinking, which is the foundation of christianity and all of the philosophies and religions adjacent to and descended from it.

The only people who will obtain anything from reading this are those who experienced a similar upbringing or have a similar disposition to myself. Regarding christians, I am speaking of those who arrived at christianity through non-religious means. Those like me who reached it through the search for an antidote against the poison which we can all recognize is corroding us today, even if we may differ in opinion on what the source of that poison is. This work is for right wing christians, to reveal truth that has been hidden from them. It is also for the non-abrahamic right wing, Pagans or Nietzscheans, so we may understand the origins and machinations of the faction that opposes us, and thus combat christianity more effectively. I unfortunately cannot “refute” christianity to the mind of any unfortunate right winger that has already been completely lost, and has had all of it’s faculties gradually eroded and destroyed on a judaic altar of faith, in the same way I cannot refute islam or any other eastern cult to a believer of them that has lost any ability to accept unequivocal truth. What I can and will refute, is the common right wing idea that christianity is conducive to European health and power. With that refutation, I will lift many sane right wing christians out of the faith that is only disintegrative to them, and consequently to the rest of us. That being said, my goal is not to terrorize or frighten harmless women, children, elders, or any other such innocuous types among the right wing who fall under the umbrella of christianity. All of those people should not read this, and they are exculpated, as I find no severe fault in them. When I say ‘right wing christians’, I mean young ones, males, under the age of forty more or less, and most especially, ones who actively engage themselves in any way against right wing Pagans and Nietzscheans. Know that throughout the entirety of this work, whenever I use very strong, cruel, or stern expressions, that they are directed against these types, the young, right wing christian men, who enthusiastically argue for their belief against non-abrahamic right wingers. I am not seeking to polemicize against any of our children, women, or old folks.

This work is divided into three primary portions, aside from this introduction, which only serves to explain what this work is, and to give some basic information about myself so that the reader has a

relatively unambiguous idea about who their author is (not anywhere near enough information for people to discover my identity though, this is hidden for obvious reasons).

In the first portion, I work from clear and pure logical principles, which even most christians could accept, and from those undeniable laws I show through the scriptures that the concept of the christian “god” is not a desirable or even a plausible thing for us, and that the commands within the scriptures themselves are both malicious and stupid. The second portion is a historical narrative of christianity itself, and will display how it entered Europe, how it grew within Europe, and how it affected Europe, from it’s inception, up until the present moment. I have tried to make this history as concise as it can be, though such a topic naturally required a great number of pages. The final portion is a dialogue. This dialogue is not written to portray events which have literally taken place or will ever take place. It is a necessary fiction which will display my arguments in a more dynamic way. I will now clarify some knowledge about my own origins, and then briefly explain some technical details regarding the terminology that I will use in this work.

Like most right wing christians, I was not born into a devout family, though christianity ever lingered in the background of my life, due purely to the fact that I was born in a western country. The religious background of my paternal family is within the Mormon church, though I was not taught anything of that faith, at least not directly, while I was still a child. Because none of my family were church goers, I did not receive baptism after my birth.

In childhood I always believed in God, and for most of my life until now I considered myself “christian”. I was taught the bare minimum ethics of the religion and some of the biblical stories in the early years of the catholic school system I attended, although they never put a particularly catholic emphasis on what was being taught. In elementary school we were shown videos about Jesus, and I liked Jesus. One day, I believe in first grade, a bishop or priest of some kind was visiting our school. He entered our class and spoke to us about faith. He had with him an archaic looking cross, and engraved on each arm of this cross were the images and names of the four evangelists, one evangelist per arm. I was fascinated by the thing, and I was allowed to examine it closely. I held it, and said the name of the saint near which my finger rested on the cross – “Luke”, and I was reminded of the character in Star Wars which I admired. For the time being I was fond of Jesus, and I disliked those who disliked him, that is the mob of people who crucified him in In the videos I was shown. I hated the Roman soldier who stabbed a spear into his stomach. When I was told about the book of Revelation by my teacher, I felt no fear, and found no objection to it. Later in elementary school, when one boy in my grade said that he did not believe in God, I felt strong hostility towards him. I did not however get baptized or receive any sacraments, because my parents were not catholic and did not care for such things. I did not enjoy the church services I attended either. There were several throughout the year that my catholic school attended, and my family have told me that I was once reprimanded by the school staff for speaking uncaringly during mass, though I have no memory of that instance. I do remember taking the eucharist once, because I wanted to know what it would taste like. I found that the church experience itself was incredibly tedious, and it did not help that the priest was a South American foreigner who’s speech was nearly impossible to understand clearly. I was taught the basics of the bible itself during the religion classes which were present through all twelve years I spent in the Catholic school system. I never particularly enjoyed these classes, I just thought they were a mundane but welcome break from more challenging classes, like mathematics. I considered the bible to be rather boring, but I had no genuine contempt for it.

Christianity remained as a comforting afterthought to me until around the age of thirteen. Before that age, I simply lived with religion and politics in the background while I went to school, and focused in

my free time on typical childhood interests – dinosaurs, transformers, power rangers, pokemon, x-men, et cetera.

It was in the early stages of puberty when I began formulating a worldview, after I started to glimpse just how hostile to me the world around me and it's culture were becoming. I could already perceive that the machinations of leftism and feminism were deeply antagonistic towards me. So I came to objective history, biology, and cultural art first. From those things, I gradually began to formulate the identity I now have. During the eighth grade, my friend occasionally took me to some big events at a local protestant church, at which his father was a pastor. This church was of the variety of protestantism that seeks to spread the "gospel" by appearing to be as trendy and youthful as possible. They had a vast, newly built, and somewhat shadowy gym-like space with a tall stage. In the large open area in front of this stage, the congregation would meet, and would listen to the preachings of many "cool" young pastors dressed in casual clothes, often followed by loud performances of cringe-worthy christian rock. The whole church complex was quite sprawling and labyrinthine, and I have fond memories of running around the many darkened halls and various rooms of that place with my friends when it was rather late, as one of my friends was a pastor's son, and so we had access to almost the entire complex. The place even had it's own laser tag arena. I remember one instance, me and my friends viewed one of the christian rock performances, among a very large crowd of other kids who were our age. The chorus to one of the songs was very annoying, and repetitively went "Jesus is the way, Jesus is the waaaaay". Apparently most of the other kids did not scoff at it though, as they seemed like they were into it. After the musical performance, a young pastor took over the stage and gave a heartfelt speech about the gospel to us. During the speech we were all given a small 'pocket' copy of the new testament, and the pastor on stage told everyone in a calm voice to close our eyes and make a gesture, either of placing a hand over our heart, or of raising our hand (I cannot remember for certain which it was), and while we made this gesture, he told us to repeat after him a prayer, which may have been accepting the gospel, or perhaps just allowing jesus into our hearts, I do not remember. I did not follow any of this pastors commands. What I did do was glance around the vast shadowed space, and observe what the others were doing. Everyone I could see was mindlessly obeying him in perfect submission, making the gesture, and repeating his words. I did not necessarily feel contempt or revulsion, rather, I felt awkward, embarrassed, confused, and aloof. I thought the whole spectacle was very cringe-worthy. I did not comprehend what I was seeing, and I could not relate to any of the people around me. The reason for this, is that I, and most fourteen year olds, did not yet have time at that age to severely fall behind in life, or go through some awful catastrophe, or become intensely outcasted from mainstream society. These are the true reasons why young right wingers convert to christianity , and it is not a coincidence that they always seem to convert while they are in their late teens and early twenties. That age is when the mind starts to mature to it's fully developed stage, and it is when our residual optimism and naivety from childhood fades away. We look for the solution, and the one that is placed conveniently for us to find, is christianity. The only fourteen year olds who wholeheartedly believe in christ and attend churches like that, are more or less teenagers who were brainwashed into their faith from the cradle. The true reason the whole crowd of kids in that church obeyed the pastor while I did not, is because most people are simply obedient and servile, and I am not. I saw what became of many of the kids who attended that church later on in high school, and they all swiftly became degenerates, leftists, or unremarkable, milquetoast types.

Through all the many ups and downs of high school, christianity for the most part remained firmly in the background, primarily I believe because I was too busy with teenage life, and the drama and tragedy that goes with it, to be worried about complete nonsense. When I was in my late teens, after I had already graduated from high school, I began to engage in my own investigation of religion more closely. At age eighteen, I was partial to arianism, though I was not very knowledgeable or devout at this stage,

and was still youthfully thriving and psychologically unmarred. After this, through listening to christian right wing voices on social media, I found the church I had grown up with. Catholicism was always looming in the background of my life, and so that was the church I decided to hold to, during one summer not so very many years ago, when I had only turned nineteen four short months before. I became very fervent shortly after that, during the autumn. My devotion to christianity reached it's absolute peak when I was in the latter half of my nineteenth year and during the first half of my twentieth, and for a while during this time, I was a catechumen in the catholic church. This particular instance in truth was nothing other than the flaying and immolation of my mind. No childhood embarrassment, no teenage drama, no other past shame of my own life, even comes remotely close to the utter disgrace and potent disgust that I now feel towards myself at the catholic stage of my life. Paragon of weakness, unrivalled in stupidity, epitome of hypocrisy, undeniably pitiful, all these sad epithets are well worthy of being applied to myself at that age. I engaged in intensely long prayers for my enemies, I delved into the scriptures with fervour, and of course, I argued staunchly for christ against anyone that opposed me, including right wing pagans. The catechist who instructed me in the faith recommended that I should become a priest. But this madness very rapidly became absolutely intolerable, and my mind entered a state of near total collapse. In the spring of the following year after very intense psychological strain, I exited the catholic church. I had been introduced to Luther and Calvin, and I found the rationality they brought to christianity refreshing. I still remained firmly devoted to the orthodox faction at this time, and I was still more or less in the same sorry state as I was while catholic, though my mental faculties had somewhat recovered. Near the end of that year, my mind went into accelerated recovery, and I let go of the doctrines of the orthodox faction entirely. Despite escaping, it remains true that over one entire prime year of my life, approximately from one autumn when I was nineteen until the next when I was twenty, had been completely forfeited. Gone, into oblivion forever, because of my former devotion to the great lie of christianity.

Over the next span of time I still called myself "christian", though I was non-trinitarian, and did not attend any church, nor did I pray regularly. However, I did still read the scriptures and delve into other christian content. I remained in this state for about one year, when in the autumn, I finally left christianity forever at the age of twenty-one, and began to hold to the philosophy which I currently maintain, without any veneer or pretension of christianity which I previously held. During my time as a christian I read the scriptures and studied the faith more diligently than most christians ever have or ever will, and I have continued to study the machinations of christianity since apostatizing. To protect myself I will say nothing of my current age other than that it is below thirty.

I must admit there is one firmly positive change which christianity caused in me, that is that it made me truly despise vulgar and obnoxious humour. Due to this change in my mentality, I also came to notice that christians themselves are unfailingly some of the most vulgar and obnoxious people to have ever lived. It is simply amazing, but not in a good way, how they manage to go from making blatantly obscene displays of behaviour, to a moment later talking about how christianity is the only true way to live.

To answer two questions very simply, of why I am not a christian, and why christianity is detrimental to Europeans, comes down to one reason with two broad causes. The reason is that christianity has absolutely nothing beneficial to offer, but can easily bestow a great deal of malefic poisons. Every single thing that christians like to boast that only their faith can offer, is in fact given far more powerfully and effectively by other beliefs, many of which don't contain the cruel agonies that christianity inflicts upon the helpless minds of its countless victims among us.

No joy, certainly no empowerment of any kind at all, and not even truth is offered by the christian faith to me, or any person willing to put objective reality above sentimental feverish intuition. Any “truths” that it pretends to possess cannot be demonstrated, and they do not go beyond the obnoxiously stupid level of any given person simply stating they “feel” like something obviously false is actually true and so therefore, it is. I should not need to explain why that scenario is appallingly idiotic. If you are right wing, then you should know exactly why.

The two causes which make christianity this way, the two ingredients of this poison, are the behaviour of the christian god character within the bible, and the behaviour of his followers within history and everyday life, which is subordinate to the behaviour of their god in the bible. I will now proceed to explain thoroughly both of these irreconcilable problems, but before I do I will define the main defects which cause right wingers to cling on to christianity, largely unaware of these issues. I then shall explain several details about the way I will write, and some of the terminology I will use.

There are four primary flaws which cause the majority of the right wing to linger ineffectually within christianity, almost completely oblivious to it’s glaring problems. I believe that some of these factors directly caused me to hold to christianity for such a long time. The first two defects are more innocuous than the others, and these less malicious ones will be explained first. I list these primarily so that the non-abrahamic right may better understand the average right wing christian psychologically. Christians should not be offended by these, but rather they should pay close attention to them, and try to be as reflective as they can.

I: The Defect of Innocuous Ignorance

This is simply a consequence of the insufficient education that we receive from the modern liberal system. We are not taught the history of our race, especially the events in Europe during late antiquity that I will reveal, and we are not educated in the literature that our progenitors produced, or the mindset that they possessed. This causes us to place little or no value on those things, and so when we begin to observe severe problems within our lives and our societies, we seek christianity, as it is common, simple, convenient, and intuitively seems to be a viable solution within the mind of the average, unlearned young right winger. What little education in history that we do receive at school is usually steeped in moralistic traditions that originate from christianity and liberalism. Another factor which also produces this defect of ignorance is the absence of scriptural knowledge among right wing christians themselves. Many of them do not read their scriptures or attend church at all, and the ones that do are typically not very devoted to engaging in those acts.

II: The Defect of Complacency

The mainstream right wing always fearmongers against any notion of realism, but the truth is that naïve optimism which produces complacency is what is actually a severe threat to us. Young right wing men today often live very complacent lives, doing little or nothing to improve themselves or their own faction. Several things contribute to this, and one of them is christianity, with it’s doctrine of the end times (along with other doctrines that we will soon examine), which inherently gives right wingers the paralyzing notion that leftism will eventually be destroyed, even if the right completely fails. Other factors that enforce complacency strongly are video games and pornography, both of which are very heavily

consumed by young right wing christians, and which have been both proven clearly to be pacificatory. The right wing christian who has his belly full, along with access to escapism such as video games and pornography, will simply be very content to have christianity answer the difficult questions which he occasionally contemplates. This is because christianity presents itself in a very plain and simple fashion which can be understood by even the most simple person, and it also has cheap and easy defence mechanisms prepared for any possible objections, these mindless and facile apologetic tactics are more than enough to keep christianity entrenched firmly within the minds of the unreflective right wing masses.

These first two defects I believe can be mediated and cured with relative ease if we try, and I hope that this book and the knowledge within it will help with that. The next two defects however are more dire, and are far more difficult to root out. In many cases they can cause terminal christianity among our faction, and if a right wing christian is suffering from either of these conditions, they will be far less likely to be convinced by the words of this book.

III: The Defect of Insufficient Intelligence

Christians, Nietzscheans, and Pagans all prize honesty. It would be a truthful thing to say that a vast amount of those among the right wing today are not exactly the most intellectual of people, to put it lightly. The wider multitude of the right wing, especially within the United States, do originate from the humble populations which made up the agricultural peasantry of previous centuries. Some of us can trace our lineage directly to warriors and nobility, but for most, especially in certain parts of America, they must be content with being of the stock of farmers and workers, and that is okay. Christianity, indeed seems to have been deliberately calculated to appeal to these mentally vulnerable lower castes. It is also no secret that christianity is directly correlated with lower IQ scores among populations across the world, whereas irreligion does not have any such correlation. In America geography also plays a strong role, as the wider nation is itself a christian stronghold, though the heart of this stronghold is the very populous southern states. Yes, some christians do have some intelligence. However, it is not a coincidence that the few christians who can string together sentences to form an argument which uses words that contain more than three syllables are almost always from the southern states, or elsewhere in America. Exceptions are not common. These Americans form the apologists of christianity, and are some of the only christians who have a reasonable amount of intelligence (though none of their arguments are very strong, and they often rely on simple emotional cues and other performers tricks). The reason these types manage to cling adamantly to christianity, despite having some amount of intelligence, is simply due to childhood brainwashing, as they are Americans, and christian brainwashing starting from childhood is still relatively common there, especially in the south, where christianity is deeply engrained into the cultural fabric, and the population itself suffers from a lower IQ on average. In some cases, apologists are genuine scammers or pedophiles, and they are actively malicious against their victims, who they know are probably too stupid to find out about their crimes, though even if they do find out, the malicious apologist is aware that he will simply be forgiven the moment he “repents”, as that is what christianity demands. Apologists rarely convert outsiders, rather their task is mainly in comforting (or preying upon) the teeming christian masses of America. It is also not a coincidence that so many of us non-christian right wingers, including myself, are not Americans. Geography plays a much stronger role than people usually realize. But regarding intelligence, many of the symptoms which have been proven to arise from deficient intelligence

do in fact go seamlessly with christianity, and these flaws are often promoted by christianity, either directly or implicitly, as ideal. I will discuss several of them now.

Avoidance of novelty, curiosity, and learning – This is all too common among the christian right wing. They often do not learn or improve in any tangible way, they simply remain in the same inert state, wasting away playing video games and watching pornography. Though they may verbally denounce those things, their actions say otherwise. Many of them do not even bother to look deeply into their own scriptures, let alone classical Pagan literature.

Diminished ability to reflect on their own lives – While they remain in such an ineffectual way of life, many do not contemplate it at all, let alone deeply. Despite being in such a sorry state, they are able to stay rather content and mild for several years, even if they begin to suffer from depression, as they often do. Only after a very extended period of idleness do they typically begin to realize that a disaster has befallen them. It is very apparent that non-christian right wingers are often much more energetic, reflective, and averse to stagnation.

Difficulty comprehending logic and abstract thinking – This is quite self explanatory, the christian preference is for timid intuition instead of rigorous logic or investigation.

Ineptitude in romance and interpersonal relationships – It is no secret that most of the right wing youth do not come from the ‘popular’ cliques of our modern schools. The guy with a loving circle of friends and abundant girlfriends does not care about politics. Young right wingers very often are those who lacked significant social and romantic experiences during our years at school. Anyone who denies this is just coping. It is a harsh truth, but we must understand the truth in order to obtain certainty about our circumstances, so that we may become as politically effective as we can reasonably be. The absence of romantic prowess is true for the wider right wing youth, though nowhere among the right is this defect more pronounced and severe than among christians. This misfortune is even taken as a point of pride among right wing christians, as if it is anything to gloat about. Many of them let their youth fade away while they merely rot in prayer, anime, and video games, having never experienced romantic or sexual activity with any girl at all. Because they are commonly low IQ (I don’t mean in the strict sense of an IQ below 70, rather, I mean an IQ that is in the double-digits, or at most, within the common middle area at the very top of the bell curve), it takes them a very long time to reflect on such a severe problem. By the time they do realize what has happened it is often too late to recover, and what remains for them is madness and despair. I would say that young, right wing Pagan men are often abundantly more successful with the opposite sex, and I believe that most honest right wing christians even would agree with this.

Easily frightened – We can see this as being naturally expected, as christianity is more tame and focused on passive pursuits as opposed to war. I have observed that right wing christians are quite timid and frail when it comes to confrontation, they seemingly do not have a strong will to fight, and this fearfulness is very often itself consequential of an unremarkable IQ. We can only expect that young right wing christians would praise and cling to a system which does not chastise them for their defects, but instead offers them comfort and eternal heaven for no real cost at all.

It should additionally be noted that many of these symptoms also arise from the mental illness of autism, which undeniably afflicts many young right wingers, especially christians. These are only four examples of the symptoms of diminished intelligence, but I encourage the readers to examine the subject more closely on their own, and to further perceive how christianity often preys upon vulnerable and humble people who exhibit these mental traits. A right wing christian suffering from a low IQ simply will not resonate with this book, because as I have said before it appeals to logic and rationality, which is the opposite of the blind faith and intuition that is widely preferred by low IQ people.

IV: The Defect of Terminal Cowardice

This defect is often, but not always, the simple consequence of a double-digit IQ. One suffering from such fearfulness will of course be incredibly vulnerable to the methods of christianity, which rely heavily on the imposition of extreme fear, as we all know. The mind is just as influenced by genetics as the body is, and it is true that a great multitude of young right wing christians (especially in southeast America) originate from extremely humble stock, and I believe that these working castes of former days have largely passed on their behaviour to their descendants. A large part of the way of life which was found among the peasantry of America was christianity, which takes advantage of the natural fearfulness that exists within the minds of the lower castes. I hope to show in this book that there is indeed nothing to fear, and that neither the scriptures nor the church are so immune to attacks as many seem to believe. There are however many who will simply be too fearful to let go of christianity even after reading this, and this cowardice is most often due to a meagre IQ as I have said. Another factor aside from a low IQ that causes extreme cowardice in the face of reality is childhood brainwashing, which is also one of the main factors that has kept christianity going relatively strongly throughout the centuries.

I believe that while I was christian, the chief defects that afflicted me were innocuous ignorance, and complacency, combined to a small degree with undeveloped intelligence, as I was much younger during my christian days, and my mind had not yet developed physically to a more advanced state. With this work I hope to alleviate the multitude of right wing christians who are in the same place that I once was, though I accept that I cannot help the many right wing christians who simply suffer from a double-digit IQ or severe fearfulness, as these factors are pivotal to the operation of christianity within the human mind, and I cannot offer a remedy which could simply raise someone's IQ, or heal the terminal cowardice that was instilled in them since they were born through the actions of their parents.

Now, to discuss terminology. If you are truly right wing, then you should not care about my use of racial terms. If you are concerned about that, then I suppose you will just have to cover your eyes whenever I use them. One might ask what I mean exactly by 'right wing' in this writing, and I mean what is usually referred to colloquially as "the far right". When I use the term 'orthodox faction', I am not referring to the eastern orthodox church. I am referring to the group who's machinations in late antiquity gave rise to all of the primary denominations that exist today, and basically all of the churches that right wingers participate in – catholic, byzantine, and the vast majority of the protestant denominations. I use the term 'byzantine' in reference to the eastern orthodox church. When I am talking about various emperors, if the emperor in question happens to be the son or grandson of another emperor with the same name, I will simply affix their number to their name, for the sake of clarity, and to avoid all possible confusion in the narrative. For example, if I am writing about the christian emperor Constantius the second, I will write his name as 'Constantius II', even though it would be more grammatically correct to refer to him as 'Constantius'. If I was to write in the more academically accepted way, he would possibly be confused with his grandfather, who was also named Constantius, but was a Pagan. Instead of referring to that emperor as 'Constantius I', I will simply call him 'Constantius'. Likewise with the emperor Theodosius and his grandson of the same name, emperor Theodosius II.

I will use the term 'Europeans' or 'Indo-Europeans' to refer to our race, whether in Europe, Oceania, North America, or elsewhere, and not specifically to any people who happen to reside in Europe itself. Yes, autists, I know that only a portion of our DNA is 'Indo-European' strictly speaking. I use the term because there is often no better alternative. Lastly, I will use the term 'Pagan' unapologetically,

despite the fact that many Pagans interpret it as a derogatory term. I do not find it to be derogatory in any way, as the original meaning of the word in Latin was simply referring to the ‘rustic’ or ‘rural’ nature of Pagans, and only a modern leftist or an early christian would consider either of those terms to be good insults. I don’t see anything wrong with the countryside or nature, and so I don’t find the term ‘Pagan’ to be offensive. At some points, I will write so as to speak directly to any readers that are christian. This work is not written in the style of a modern, academic, peer-reviewed paper. This is a work of literature, and it holds the reader accountable enough to be able to look into primary sources themselves if they wish, and to not rely on constant citations of other academic writings.

I: The christian god

I am the exact opposite of most christians, who adore the new testament and disdain the old. Nearly all of the problems with christianity for us arise from the new testament, and not from the old, even though the old certainly is at times quite very questionable to say the least. Anyone with a shred of honesty or dignity can admit that the two texts are only related through a tangential and disharmonious union at the desperate hands of christians themselves. If a christian does not want to admit the blatant truth that the two are not one, then they are merely denying reality. If one has actually read them, one will know how different the two are, and that if anyone who was not already brainwashed into christian dogma was given both of them, and then read them both, they would not find any significant connection between the two. I too can take two books that share some vague motifs and say “See! They are both one book together!”, but someone merely wishing for something to be true does not make their wish automatically come true. If we can observe and prove that two things contradict each other, then we know for a fact that they are not the same, and are therefore not one. To deny this very pure method is to adopt the incomprehensible doctrine of leftist solipsism itself, and to implicitly promote everything that it promotes.

Although compared to archaic and classical Greek literature the old testament is rather barbarous or primitive, it still proves itself to be far superior to the new testament or any other early christian writings. The God of the old testament is more unapologetic and clear in his actions than the being that is written of in the new testament, and I would argue that his behaviour is (a lot of the time) roughly more similar to Zeus or Jupiter than to the god character in the new testament. When reading Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, one might notice that the writing style is somewhat similitudinous to many portions of the old testament. This not to say that abrahamism and Paganism are of equal coherence, and I do believe that the Pagan system of metaphysics is far more sophisticated, and stands up to investigation far better than any abrahamic system. However, there are several ways in which the god of the old testament is comparable to the Indo-European king of the gods. They both accept animal sacrifice, they promote the construction of temples, as well as altars and pillars, the pouring of libations, violent conquest and subordination of opposing peoples, legalistic implementation of hierarchy, and strict punishment of crimes. Note that all of these things are either outright abolished, or placed within very uncertain territory in the new testament. The primary differences which set the old testament god apart from the Pagan king of the gods are that the old testament god forbids the creation of images, and commands that no other gods can be worshiped. Christians often claim that their god is unique and more refined because of the ten commandments, and that the pagans were somehow so lost without these commandments. Christians do not realize that these commandments were held almost universally by the majority of ancient peoples, and that promoting them in Greece or Rome would’ve been seen as stating what is abundantly obvious. The only unique commandments are those which pertain to the worship of a single god without an image.

The Pagan gods, and (to a lesser degree) the old testament god seem more to be reflections of observable nature itself, as opposed to a transcendent and “perfect” being, with goals of universal peace and free will for all. Even regarding the afterlife, the old testament differs heavily with the new, and is more in line with the earlier strains of the Indo-European beliefs, where the afterlife is of little concern, and not the central axis on which the entire belief system rotates, like it is with christianity, islam, zoroastrianism, and gnosticism. In the ancient times the focal point was more often the folk, race, city, or nation which actually exists, and not a speculative afterlife. I do not consider the handful of incredibly vague ‘sheol’ verses dispersed within the vast and sprawling old testament to have any serious relation at all with the incessant whining threats of eternal fire that saturate the pages of the much more brief new testament.

What stops me from following the old testament is very obvious, and the simple reasons are that I am not an ancient judean, or an ancient israelite, and neither were any of my ancestors as far as I know. Even if I wanted to somehow proselytize, it would be impossible to even attempt to fully follow mosaic law found in the *Torah*, as there is currently no temple or tabernacle, and the ark of the covenant no longer exists as far as we know. So in my eyes the old testament is simply an interesting survival of literature from the ancient world, although I have no ancestral connection to it at all.

Now I will go into the details of why I find the doctrines of the new testament to be completely unacceptable. I reiterate that I am well familiar with the new testament and have read the entire thing, most of the books within it I have read several times, and I have also studied Christian theology closely for years of my life.

So, anyone who would wish to use the tired argument that I “don’t understand christianity” will have to find another argument. I understand it just fine. Much better in fact than most christians do, especially considering the fact that the majority of christians do not even bother to read their own scriptures, let alone learn theology. I comprehend it flawlessly, I simply do not downplay it’s flaws and implications. The fact that I reject an assertion does not mean that I do not understand the assertion. What christians and leftists cannot understand is that it is entirely possible for someone to fully comprehend their viewpoint, and still reject it. If anything, it is these groups themselves who don’t understand anything. This is because their own beliefs often lull them into a passive state, and give to them a very embarrassing superiority complex based on nothing other than their subjective, irrational whims. It also instills a false sense of security, causing them to automatically dismiss ancient Indo-European literature as being either “demonic”, “outdated”, or “racist”.

No one can use the accusation that I am simply “stubborn” or unwilling to change either, because it is true that I have changed and intellectually grown immensely over the years, unlike christians who all too often are the ones who blindly adhere to the system which they have been taught from birth, and remain mentally in an inert, rotting state of psychological disintegration throughout their lives. Christians are the ones who are unwilling to change. Not me.

Currently I focus on classical literature. No, I am not talking about Charles Dickens or Oscar Wilde. The term ‘classical’ traditionally referred to the surviving writings from classical civilization, that is the Greeks and Romans. Today most people cannot even remotely fathom those supreme empires, and the majority merely think of 19th century liberal fiction novels upon hearing the term ‘classics’.

The literature I now read is indeed labelled “demonic” by many christians, as the writers of it did worship what christians call “demons”, but there was a time not so long ago when I read from the bible every day, and I quickly familiarized myself with all of the books, though it has been a long time now since I’ve regularly read from it. Recently I decided to refresh my memory by returning to it, and I read the books of *Ephesians* and *Jude*, which are both short enough to easily read in one sitting. What struck me was how incredibly dull and paltry they seem now, even the famous and often quoted verses from those books which I once agreed passionately with, and which were already burned into my subconscious from years past. They are just bland, distasteful, and empty seeming to me now, and I am not sorrowful that they are gradually fading from my mind.

But not only is it bland. I would go as far to say that the new testament is thoroughly revolting to me now.

Although the old testament comes across as a primitive rambling manuscript describing the defeats and victories of an obscure group of ancient tribes, it still maintains a kind of rustic charm and atavism which at least makes it somewhat tolerable, despite its foreign nature. The new testament however, contains nothing of the kind. Although it does generally seem to have been written more smoothly and carefully, its message is utterly repulsive and intolerable.

Its message denigrates, slanders, despises, and seeks to destroy our health, beauty, and victory. The very same attack which leftist modernity and all its adherents launch on us. The core aspect of this poison is hatred of material reality and nature, with all of its alleged “unfairness”. How so? Christianity is against violence, and reproduction. The two primary activities that continue nature’s cycle, death and life respectively.

Now I can hear christians explaining that it accepts both of those things, only in a refined, appropriate, and discerned manner. They will insist that it only seeks to excise wanton or unnaturally excessive forms of sex and violence. Though if we take the scriptures of the new testament seriously, we see that this very obviously is not the case. Even if we take the path of most christians, and downplay or brush off the life-denying passages, then we still in fact have a doctrine which firmly lays out the foundations for the pervasive decay of modernity.

Before I begin, I must explain the basic principles of peripatetic Aristotelian logic which I will use for my arguments in this portion of the work. This will be useful for any right winger to learn, and these principles should (hopefully) be something that christian right wingers will be able to agree with.

There are many that consciously disregard logical law, commonly in modern times by giving a ridiculous appeal to “quantum physics”. Unsurprisingly, you will find people that hold every irrational belief under the sun who all claim that quantum physics just so happens to prove their specific absurdity of pregerence, whether it be islam, christianity , gnosticism, or leftism generally. In truth, scientists who’s allegiance is actually to quantum physics and not to dogmatism will tell us the reality of the matter, which is that quantum physics is just what it is called – physics, and it cannot in fact prove, nor disprove contentious philosophical topics such as free will, the prime mover, or the afterlife. The fact is, that the only worldview which can be possessed by the individual who wholly denies these following principles of logic, is a worldview that is unequivocally incomprehensible, and insane, whether they be a leftist, or a christian.

Logic forms the very foundation of a classical education, along with grammar and rhetoric. These subjects were taught to the warrior aristocracies throughout much of Europe since at least the Greek archaic age. Though they seem to be much older than this, and there is even some logical writings present within the Rigveda, an Indo-European epic text which is much more ancient even than the works of Homer. Logic was still taught in an altered form during the christian era, and it has only been largely removed from our curriculums since the great wars of the twentieth century have ended. Logic, contrary to what most people in modernity seem to think, is not merely a vague word that is synonymous with intelligence or critical thinking. In reality, logic is a discipline with strict rules, and it is closely related to mathematics. The logical principles which I will use come from the peripatetic school of Aristotle. For those who do not know, Aristotle was one of the most accomplished and influential philosophers in

history, and he was also the teacher Alexander the Great. The foundation on which the logic of Aristotle is based is a principle known as the law of non-contradiction.

The most secure of all beliefs is that mutually contradictory statements cannot be jointly true.

-Aristotle, Metaphysics

A proposition can only be true or false, and cannot be both or neither. If one holds to this law, it thusly follows that any argument which is composed of contradictory propositions is inherently invalid, and can be discarded. Subordinate to the law of non-contradiction is the principle of identity. This principle holds simply that everything is itself. For example, $1 = 1$, or $A = A$. So, any proposition in which $A \neq A$, is false according to the principle of identity. Everything is what it is, everything is not what it is not, and nothing is neither or both. To give a clear example, the proposition 'all cats are dogs' is false, as the terms 'cat' and 'dog' are contradictory, and thusly cancel each other out and invalidate the proposition.

One might notice that from these very pure and clear laws alone, leftist egalitarian dogma is proven beyond any doubt to be false. The very proposition on which all of modern liberal thought rests, the lie that all are equal, is effectively a statement of denial against the law of non-contradiction. A warrior aristocrat is not equal to a vulgar boor, thus they should not be regarded by us in the same manner. The Europeans are not equal to negroids, and so our race should not treat both equally, et cetera. The primary impulse of leftism in all of its forms is to fight against social differentiation, and if you promote a system that completely throws out logic in favour of blind intuition or faith as christianity does, then you are implicit in spreading the leftist impulse, no matter how much you may claim to be right wing. It is demonstrably true that all things are subject to observable laws, whether we approve of their existence or not, and it also demonstrably true that no jew ever has, or ever will be able to change these laws, nor can any jew arbitrarily dictate to us when we are allowed to believe that our senses are and are not accurate. I know that many will say something like "yeah logic is good for the basics, but we need christianity for higher ideas".

That statement is extremely innocuous sounding, but in reality is highly dangerous, and leads only to modernity when put into practice. If you have a system in which not just some logic, but one-hundred percent of logic is made null and void within doctrine that is taught, then you essentially allow people to pick and choose when they do and do not want to adhere to provable truth. The inevitable result of that scenario is the confusion of modernity. No jewish preacher gets to show up and tell us that our senses are actually not to be trusted, even if he existed at all. Sorry christians. But for those of you who think that white people are actually the real jews, I can very easily eradicate your delusion.

Leviticus 13: 29-38 (ESV)

When a man or woman has a disease on the head or the beard, the priest shall examine the disease. And if it appears deeper than the skin, and the hair in it is yellow and thin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean. It is an itch, a leprous disease of the head or the beard. And if the priest examines the itching disease and it appears no deeper than the skin and there is no black hair in it, then the priest shall shut up the person with the itching disease for seven days, and on the seventh day the

priest shall examine the disease. If the itch has not spread, and there is in it no yellow hair, and the itch appears to be no deeper than the skin, then he shall shave himself, but the itch he shall not shave; and the priest shall shut up the person with the itching disease for another seven days. And on the seventh day the priest shall examine the itch, and if the itch has not spread in the skin and it appears to be no deeper than the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him clean. And he shall wash his clothes and be clean. But if the itch spreads in the skin after his cleansing, then the priest shall examine him, and if the itch has spread in the skin, the priest need not seek for the yellow hair; he is unclean. But if in his eyes the itch is unchanged and black hair has grown in it, the itch is healed and he is clean, and the priest shall pronounce him clean.

We all know how silent the bible generally is when it comes to the physical descriptions of people, but in the above lines we learn beyond a reasonable doubt that the Hebrews had black hair. Not blonde, not red, not brown, but black. The verse literally says that yellow hair among them was a symptom of leprosy. Their natural hair colour was black. Their language comes from the Afro-Asiatic family and not from the Indo-European family. These people were not white. I will now return from this brief digression back to my explanation of the logic of Aristotle.

Within peripatetic logic, a syllogism is a logical argument which is the equivalent of a mathematical equation. A simplistic mathematical equation consists of two numbers with a relational sign, followed by a result. Likewise, a simplistic syllogism consists of two premises related by content, followed by a conclusion that results from the premises.

Lastly, a syllogism is a sentence in which certain things being laid down, something else different from the premises necessarily results, in consequent of their existence.

-Aristotle, Prior Analytics

In the equation $6 + 6$, the result naturally is 12. Within a syllogism, if both premises are true, it necessarily follows that the conclusion is also true, and is completely inarguable for any sane person. If we break a basic syllogism down into the most simplistic possible form of expression, we get this:

Premise 1: $A=B$

Premise 2: $B=C$

Conclusion: $A=C$

A very basic example is this:

All rottweilers are dogs ($A=B$)

All dogs are animals ($B=C$)

Therefore, all rottweilers are animals ($A=C$)

Because this syllogism has been constructed properly, and without violation of the law of non-contradiction or of the principle of identity, and because both the premises of this syllogism are true, it is objectively impossible for the conclusion to be false, and it is therefore both valid, and infallible. However, it is possible for one to construct a valid syllogism that has a false conclusion, as a syllogism being valid does not automatically mean the conclusion is true. This is just the same as what is found within mathematics, as even if one performs a calculation correctly, if one of the numbers within the equation was incorrect, the result also will be incorrect. Here is an example of a syllogism that is valid, but is also not true:

Ancient soldiers believed that war was a glorious and important experience

Believing war as glorious and important is something that only insane and evil people do

Ancient soldiers were all insane and evil people

Now, the second premise in that syllogism is obviously incorrect, and can be proven false, and so the conclusion can be discarded as false. In a Pagan system of metaphysics where war is something divine, and not a result of original sin, the falsehood of the second premise is abundantly obvious. Pagan metaphysical systems also generally stand up to logical inquiry far more strongly than abrahamic systems do. However, even using pure naturalism without metaphysics, we can still prove that engaging in war is in many cases a healthful behaviour, and has been a very unavoidable and enthralling part of life on earth for virile human men throughout all of history. We can also prove that highly abnormal things like self castration are naturally unhealthy, leading to the weakening and corruption of the organism, and that the only people who would engage in that sort of act are either under a mental disease themselves, or are being forced to do so physically against their will. Now, I will display another syllogism which is also valid, but false.

Right wingers should not engage in degenerate leftist behaviour

Degenerate leftist behaviour is sex and violence

Right wingers should not engage in sex and violence

Since all of the components of a syllogism are present, and the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises, it is technically valid. However, this does not make it correct automatically. An intelligent reader will notice that the second premise of this syllogism is false, because there is nothing inherently degenerate or left wing about sex and violence (at least for Pagans there isn't). Therefore, the conclusion itself is false as well. If right wingers, or any group for that matter, uphold the conclusion of that syllogism, they are doing nothing other than crippling themselves, and giving their enemies a severe advantage which will lead almost certainly to defeat of the party that has placed itself under false restrictions, because of a false argument. In the rest of this work, and especially in this portion of the work, I will show through the scriptures themselves that christianity does in fact uphold, either directly, or implicitly, the false syllogism above, and because of this the majority of the right wing is disintegrated, and stuck within a stunted and ineffectual state. I will also point out some occasions when christian doctrine violates the foundational logical laws which I have explained above. I will sometimes present my arguments in a syllogistic format, and occasionally I will display erroneous syllogisms which are implied by christianity.

I will start with violence, and I will now list the verses from the new testament which I formerly coped with. These were the verses I once used, to try to convince myself that violence was acceptable for christians occasionally, on the grounds of self-defence, or defence of ones family or community, and I will explain why my fevered, semi-coherent interpretation of years past is false. These verses also are generally popular among right wing christians who give a futile attempt to syncretize their violence-related worldly concerns with their faith, just as I once did.

As a forewarning to right wing christians who are about to read this, know that I make no apology for my forceful use of strong expressions, as it is plainly evident that engaging with the christian right in a restrained manner is not effective. Also know that there is no possible “refutation” of my explanations that you could offer which I have not already heard, and that none of your supposed refutations are logically coherent, nor do they rely on any other tactic besides “yuo is wrongz because I say so!”. I have heard them all, and they do not make the cut. Sorry christians, it really doesn’t matter at all if you can point to saint A or theologian B and say “nuh uh! Muh saint A said this, and theologian B said that, therefore there is no problem!”

The only true way that you could “fix” all of the life-denying verses would be to remove them entirely, or edit them to the degree of them becoming completely unrecognizable, and having a meaning that is opposed to what the verse in question previously said. These are obviously things that you will never do.

If we can prove that a glaring problem exists, then it simply exists, whether you go “nuh uh!” or not. Just because you are low IQ enough to downplay it, brush it off, and live in cognitive dissonance as if there is no problem, it does not mean that people with more intellectual mettle than you are able to live in the same state of mental cowardice that you live in. It is a demonstrable fact that low IQ simpletons can tolerate contradictory beliefs more readily than intelligent people can. The feebly attempted “refutations” that christians can offer will become especially meaningless after we have gone through the historical narrative, where I prove beyond any reasonable doubt that christianity was nothing more than an early incarnation of liberalism, and had nothing to do with warrior aristocracies, but was constantly and diametrically opposed to them.

“But without muh bible, there is no foundation!”

To you, perhaps, to you there is no foundation. But all this proves is that your dusty, single-core CPU cannot handle a superior program, and so you need to stick to an inferior slave program that was designed from the ground up to appeal to your simple mind.

“But your interpretations are wrong! Go read saint A and find out!”

I have read early saints, probably a lot more than you have. Let me spell it out plainly for you, since I know that your mind can only comprehend extremely simple things – If you have a book which has a great number of abjectly questionable life-negating passages, and you do not remove them, but instead promote said book unaltered as infallible and perfect, then you are effectively promoting life-denial, and thusly you are promoting leftist moralism. This is true regardless of what saint A wrote in his own book, and we will see the positive correlation between christianity and leftism as demonstrably true over the course of this work. Also true is the fact that despicable preachers of other life-negating ideologies always deny their crimes through pathetic and spurious statements of denial that are effectively no different than what christians offer. The words of all of these slaves and deceivers are utterly useless, if we can prove that what they promote is indeed degenerate, and this we can easily do in every instance, whether it is buddhism, christianity, sikhism, or anything else of that sort.

For non-abrahamic right wingers who may use this book in any way against christians, just know that whenever a christian says – “You just aren’t able to understand muh scripturez at all because you don’t have faith!”, what they are actually saying is – “You just aren’t stupid or cowardly enough to downplay these irreconcilable problems and accept my spurious personal interpretation #5345643974, because you don’t submit to idiotic propositions that are made without any evidence!”

Now I will begin to examine the scriptures. Here are the verses I formerly utilized in a misguided attempt to convince myself that being an authoritarian right winger was perfectly harmonious with christianity, in the days before I realized that those two inputs are mutually contradictory.

Matthew 10:34 (ESV)

Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.

This sounds powerful superficially, but there is no directly affirmative instruction for violence given. The verse is vague and clearly metaphorical, and also does not state that his followers will send a sword, or use swords in any way, he simply states that he himself will “send a sword”, whatever that shall mean. Most christians identify the sword in this verse as the same one in *Ephesians*. In that book, Paul reveals what this “sword” actually is, and those familiar with scripture know that it has nothing to do with violence. What this verse is saying is that the adoption of the new faith would, as the verse admits, not cause peace, but instead cause drastic changes and turbulence in society. According to the new testament itself, none of the commands given to christians are in any way even remotely related to violence, or self-defence. It seems impossible to reasonably equate the “sword” in this verse as being anything other than the metaphorical one in *Ephesians* that most christians identify it as.

There is a verse similar to this one that right wingers also like to cope with, it is the passage in *Luke* where Jesus tells his followers to buy swords. This is one of the best verses that right wingers have, but it ultimately comes to nothing at all, because shortly after that verse, when there is an attempt made by Peter to actually use his sword, Jesus reprimands him for it. After this within the rest of the new testament, there are no more mentions of physical christian swords at all, and from Acts, to the Pauline and other epistles, to Revelation, there is no mention at all of christians ever using swords or being violent in any way. With that in mind, it seems that the only reason Jesus told his followers to buy swords, was so that he could feed them the moralistic “put away your sword” line shortly after.

John 2:15 (ESV)

And making a whip of cords, he drove them all out of the temple, with the sheep and oxen. And he poured out the coins of the money-changers and overturned their tables.

He purges the temple himself, not with the help of his followers. Let me say that once more, because I know that many christians reading this might need to have it repeated, and that right wing christians love this verse more than almost any other. Christians – he does this himself, and does not ever

ask you to help him. He never once instructs his followers to imitate or assist him, and no mention is given of his followers helping him during this event. The overwhelming majority of christians believe in the trinity, and threaten all others to believe the exact same way. Which means that in this case, within their own interpretation, it is literally the triune god himself acting against the money lenders, and since he is fully god, he is on perfectly stable metaphysical grounds to do so, and his mortal followers are not. If he wanted his followers to join him in the attack, he would've commanded them to do so at some point.

Acts 5:29 (ESV)

But Peter and the apostles answered, "We must obey God rather than men."

Many today, and myself formerly believed that this verse provides biblical grounds for self-defence against tyrannical rulers, but it simply does not say that. If it's read in context with the rest of new testament it reveals that to "obey God" for the christians simply means partaking in their religion of rigid pacifism, and refusing to bow down to anyone or anything other than the christian god, even if that would mean being slaughtered by the powers that be.

Matthew 18:6 (ESV)

but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened around his neck and to be drowned in the depth of the sea.

Here he is simply saying that it would have been better for the offender to have died that way than to face what god will do to him as a punishment for the offence. He does not order or even imply that his followers should punish offenders in this verse in any way at all. If he did order the death penalty, as the old testament god would have, the verse would say something like " but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, you shall fasten a great millstone around his neck and release him to be drowned in the depth of the sea." Yet, it does not say that. The presence of "it would be better" makes it a statement of faith in the christian god, and not an order for any worldly death penalty. To believe that this is a death penalty verse requires an incredibly intense denial of the blatant evidence, and an uncomfortable suspension of one's disbelief.

Any sane man who has not been physically or emotionally castrated should agree in a heartbeat that those who harm our children should be punished, by us, severely and in broad daylight, rather than relying on a "god" who's existence is laughably questionable, and in the case of the christian god, even if he did exist, he would simply lovingly forgive the offender so long as said offender begs and whines for forgiveness hard enough. In real life we can prove that these kind of offenders almost always go back to their previous ways, and that public execution is objectively the best medicine to put a stop to the disease which has overtaken them. Not only them but many others who are guilty of heinous actions should receive the same treatment, if one uses naturalism and logic instead of the sentimental faith in empty values of leftists and christians.

The classic anti-death penalty christian counter argument against me here is something along the lines of "erm who are heckin we to punish others, when our own flippin sins are just as bad! Vengeance is mine, thus saith the lord!!".

This is an appalling, cowardly, and pathetically stupid line of thought. No, not all crimes are equal, and we are not all equally depraved. We are not equal at all. Getting angry at a pathetic and malicious person, and making love to a beautiful girl who desires you, are both good and naturally healthy things, not to be even remotely compared, let alone considered equal, with committing usury against hundreds of families, or other even worse offences committed against us which I will not mention. The effeminate and idiotic tendency of equalizing things is engrained into christianity, and all other eastern cults. It violates the most pure principles of the logic which has been handed down to us by our distant ancestors, who have proven themselves far superior to any christians. Indo-Europeans before christianity had no pathetic and cowardly fear of brutally punishing those who deserve death. It was rightfully understood that vengeance belongs to us, and not to a foreign god. The Danish historian Vilhelm Grønbech, in his 1911 book on Germanic Paganism titled *The Culture of the Teutons*, explains very well the psychology of the Germanic peoples. It is displayed clearly that it was vengeance that was the central experience of their culture. Their idealization of human action, and their most divine state of being, was that of the man engaged in enacting revenge. I would argue that not just the Germanics, but also the Greco-Romans were of this mindset to a large degree. Read *The Odyssey* of Homer, or *The Oresteia* of Aeschylus.

An injury done occasions a loss to the sufferer. He has been bereft of some part of his honour. But this honour is not a thing he can do without, in case of need, not a thing he requires only for luxury, and which the frugal mind can manage without. The injury he has suffered may be likened to a wound which will never close up of itself, which will bleed unceasingly until his life runs out. If he cannot fill the empty space, he will never be himself again.

-Vilhelm Grønbech, The Culture of the Teutons

No one can deny that christianity, which sprouted from an utterly foreign people, did ultimately in fact introduce into Europe the liberal tendency of not punishing criminals for their crimes. You may whine to me and show me examples of medieval christians who committed righteous violence against criminals and invaders, and say that christianity is not pacifistic, but I will reply by merely pointing out that these were men who ignored the teachings of Christ and instead acted like their pagan forefathers, devoting their lives to conquest, martial prowess, and power, while seldom or never bothering to worry about spreading the “gospel”, or giving all of their possessions to the poor, or being celibate, or any other absurdity that Jesus commanded. I will then point out to you that for every one strong christian knight, there was in fact at least one hundred pacifistic monks, priests, or hermits of the same era, who spent their lives as true christians – that is to say recluses shunning violence, spreading the “gospel”, and more often then not tucked away in some filthy cell, or wandering aimlessly through the fields, groves, and villages of a plague-ridden, depopulated, and utterly shattered European continent, while they themselves were in a fevered state of mental necrosis. It is a fact that Europe was vastly stronger and more cohesive in antiquity then it was during the age of christian dominance that is the dark ages and middle ages, and during antiquity there existed no such pacifistic, celibate order which was so voraciously widespread as the christian monks were.

Now we will look at the verses which prove beyond any shadow of a doubt the devoted pacifism that the new testament promotes, and I will state my thoughts on each verse.

Matthew 16:8 (ESV)

But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother will be liable to the council; and whoever says, 'You fool!' will be liable to the hell of fire.

Not just physical violence, but anger itself is forbidden in this verse. Yes, anger, a completely natural, inevitable, and healthy emotion which can be proven beyond any doubt to be helpful and empowering in many instances. An emotion that is deeply harmonious with nature, is outright forbidden on pain of eternal hell. This is so utterly absurd that even most christians are sane enough to find some way to downplay or ignore its laughable implications, but the only proper course of action I see is to simply throw away entirely something that is so useless and blockheaded. Christians may cope and try to contend that the presence of the word “brother” implies that it is only forbidding anger against fellow “Christians”, which usually just means those that believe the same way as the coper in question. But even if that spurious interpretation is correct, it is still a stupid verse, because there would obviously still be times in which an angry rebuke is more than appropriate, as even the “real” christians would surely still make some very grave mistakes from time to time.

The thought of teaching this verse, or any of these verses to a child makes me sick, and the only case I can possibly ponder where these verses or the new testament itself would be appropriate to teach people, would be if one wanted to create a very obedient and impotent slave caste.

Matthew 5:39 (ESV)

But I say to you, Do not resist the one who is evil. But if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.

This is an extremely ubiquitous one, and it is possibly the most well known verse next to John 3:16 or “judge not lest ye be judged”. As we can see, it is just outright pacifism, not disguised in any way. The common strategy of right wing christians trying to downplay this verse is to simply borrow verses from the old testament and say that “even the older verses still apply today, and the bible cannot contradict itself”. But as we all know, many of the verses clearly stated in the Torah to be permanent, or everlasting for all of god’s people, are in fact swiftly and casually revoked in the new testament. This fact automatically puts the entirety of the old testament on unstable ground for christians, because it allows for them the questioning of the entire old testament. Christians are lead inevitably to the line of questioning which resembles this- “If triune god is capable of changing his mind about things as important as circumcision, daily attire, animal sacrifice, diet, or the very manner of worship itself, then why would he not be able to change his mind about the violent defence of ones nation, person, or family?”

The truth is that in the new testament, the christian god character indeed does just that.

Christians can say “But the bible cannot contradict itself!” all they want, but their plight is irrelevant if the Bible can be found to contradict itself. Likewise, it does not matter if an award winning meteorologist says that it is not raining, if in fact, we go outside and prove that it is indeed raining.

For a weak minded person who believes in their own subjective sensations instead of reality, there is no problem. Because any contradiction can be brushed off. But if we are using logic, then the Bible does indeed contradict itself, which I will now demonstrate very easily.

There are several examples of contradictory statements within the bible, both of minor and major things. Much of christian theology itself is composed of contradictory propositions, but I will display a very simple biblical example that most christians consider to be innocuous.

The genealogies presented in the new testament do not match. Because christians have an incredible ability to negligently brush off reality and it's implications, they usually gloss over this without giving it serious thought. But it is not something to be glossed over. If the Bible was all true as christians say, then it would not contain any contradictions. Yet, the two genealogies negate each other. They give different names.

No, they are not just following two different lines. They both blatantly and explicitly claim to be tracing the line through Joseph, yet they do not match up. So, if we are using logic, they cannot both be true. It is one, or it is the other. You can't have both. The argument for christianity states that the bible does not contradict itself, but as I've just very clearly shown, it does indeed contradict itself. Therefore, the argument for christianity is proven to be objectively false. Christians have limited options to escape this particular dilemma. They can either dispose of one of the genealogies and the individual rendering of the gospel that contains it as being false or tampered with, which they will never do, or they can just discard dignity entirely, and still claim that the bible is true, even though it is proven that the bible contains not only contradictory genealogies, but also contradictory descriptions of specific events within the gospels and elsewhere. Details like these, such as the amount of people around the tomb of Jesus and several others, are even more firm proof of contradiction and fabrication, because they do not allow for the cope of "it's actually two different lines even though the book itself says they are the same line" that the genealogy argument allows them.

The latter option of entirely throwing away logic is insane, stupid, and cowardly. It is also the option that christians prefer to take time and time again. If you consciously throw away logic entirely, you are intellectually no more correct than the average leftist asserting that race does not exist, or the followers of any other irrational eastern cults, which christians love to project their own weaknesses on to, and insult for being "unreasonable". The sight of christians doing this is obviously very ironic. If you throw out the law of non-contradiction, then good luck comprehending the world around you. Because according to your own thinking, I could pick up a rock, and tell you that it is actually a fish, and you would not be able to tell me that I am wrong, because you yourself have murdered your own intellect.

Romans 12:19 (ESV)

Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God, for it is written, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord."

Yeah, just never fight back, and rely on your imaginary friend to do it for you. What could go wrong? In the real world it has always been much better to take martial action which can be proven to be

effective, as opposed to relying solely on something that is purely speculative at best. If our ancestors had relied on this verse, instead of their Pagan cultures which adored war, none of us would be here at all.

James 5:6 (ESV)

You have condemned and murdered the righteous person. He does not resist you.

Here James is reprimanding persecutors of the “righteous”, and he openly states that the righteous have not fought back. This means that the behaviour of the righteous consists of not fighting back, which is pacifism. If the righteous were allowed to fight back, it would say “He tries his best to resist you.” But it does not say that, because the new testament is a pacifist book to the core. Observe the following syllogism, and if you are a right wing christian, and you find both premises true, then know that the conclusion must also follow, at least for you.

Not resisting persecution or murder is the behaviour of a righteous person

Righteous behaviour is something that should be enacted by right wingers

Not resisting persecution or murder is something that should be enacted by right wingers

I do not see why either of the two premises would be considered false to a right wing christian. The first is confirmed to them by the scriptures themselves, very clearly. The second premise is what right wing christians maintain incessantly against right wing pagans. Therefore, the inevitable conclusion is true for right wing christians as well. Just forget about owning a firearm, engaging in self-defence, or ever protecting yourself or your family from a persecution. Because your god has forbidden you to do so. Of course, if we disregard christianity, we see that both premises are laughably false, and likewise the conclusion is equally stupid.

Matthew 26:52 (ESV)

Then Jesus said to him, “Put your sword back into its place. For all who take the sword will perish by the sword.”

Jesus says this to Peter after Peter performs the only example of a christian committing violence in the gospels. He reprimands Peter and outright states, or at the very least heavily implies that dying by the sword is a bad thing. The Romans, Celts, Germans, and even the early Hebrews would’ve unanimously disagreed with Jesus on that statement, and I too disagree with him. Dying by the sword in the right circumstances is something with eternal value, and an objectively beautiful and honourable way to die, despite what flaccid whining cowards, leftists, and christians may say. Some christians might say that he is only saying this to stop Peter, and that he doesn’t actually think dying by the sword is always bad. This isn’t true, because if that was the case he would’ve merely told him to put away his sword, without feeding him a morally charged aphorism which implicitly posits that dying by the sword is somehow undesirable.

John 8:7 (ESV)

And as they continued to ask him, he stood up and said to them, "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her."

In this famous verse Jesus abolishes the ancient death penalty which had maintained order and accountability within the patriarchal non-christian world for millennia. The Germans and other European groups had similar death penalty laws in place, and if we trust Tacitus's account of the Germans we know that their pagan communities were very orderly and joyful, with the little amount of adultery and other crimes among them being disposed of in ways similar to and sometimes more severe than stoning. As I have already made clear, I strongly contend that Europe's conversion to christianity ultimately removed these healthy and strict laws, and we have been made much more weak and miserable for it.

Many christians will admit that this verse is not present in the early manuscripts. Most do not say that it is fake, but take the opinion that it was omitted temporarily, in order to gain more converts among the wider population, who rightfully and perceptively thought that this verse would cause adultery to be rampant in their communities, and thus were apprehensive towards christians. Although it is possibly a fabricated verse, most christians still hold to it lovingly, and this verse with others like it annul punishment in this world that actually exists, while elsewhere the new testament offers disproportionately severe punishment in a non-existent world for any who wish to have a shred of dignity and hold people accountable. This is the utter opposite of Indo-European traditional belief which punishes justly in the real world, and is lenient about any speculative afterlife. Whether the verse was only omitted temporarily, or if the verse was totally concocted and implanted by the orthodox faction, either way it shows us what kind of people the early christians were, and how much they cared about honesty.

One writer who actually did value honesty was Tacitus, who writes of the Germanic tribes thusly:

Adulteries are very few for the number of the people. Punishment is prompt and is the husband's prerogative. Her hair close-cropped and stripped of her clothes, her husband drives her from his house in presence of his relatives and pursues her with blows through the length of the village. For prostituted chastity there is no pardon. Beauty nor youth nor wealth will find her a husband.

It is also permitted to lay accusations and to bring capital charges at this assembly. The nature of the death penalty differs according to the offence; traitors and deserters are hung from trees. Cowards, poor fighters and those who disgrace their bodies are plunged in the mud of marshes with a hurdle on their heads. The difference between punishments pertains to the principle that crime should be blazoned abroad by its retribution, but abomination hidden.

-Tacitus, Germania

I cannot quote the entirety of the *Germania* of Tacitus, but one should read it, and see that the Germanic tribes were very orderly, joyful, and cohesive, and had no sense of guilt or shame about these

laws. Note how he states that adultery was almost non-existent among them, yet, they knew nothing of Jesus or his father. Tacitus, who praised the Germans, also wrote of the jews in his *Histories*, and thankfully these words have survived to this day. But what does he have to say of these people, who were following the “true” monotheistic god for centuries, and who had spawned christianity and dispersed it into our lands?

In order to secure the allegiance of his people in the future, Moses prescribed for them a novel religion quite different from those of the rest of mankind. Among the Jews all things are profane that we hold sacred; on the other hand they regard as permissible what seems to us immoral. In the innermost part of the Temple, they consecrated an image of the animal which had delivered them from their wandering and thirst, choosing a ram as beast of sacrifice to demonstrate, so it seems, their contempt for Hammon. The bull is also offered up, because the Egyptians worship it as Apis. They avoid eating pork in memory of their tribulations, as they themselves were once infected with the disease to which this creature is subject. They still fast frequently as an admission of the hunger they once endured so long, and to symbolize their hurried meal the bread eaten by the Jews is unleavened. We are told that the seventh day was set aside for rest because this marked the end of their toils. In course of time the seductions of idleness made them devote every seventh year to indolence as well.

Whatever their origin, these observances are sanctioned by their antiquity. The other practices of the Jews are sinister and revolting, and have entrenched themselves by their very wickedness. Wretches of the most abandoned kind who had no use for the religion of their fathers took to contributing dues and free-will offerings to swell the Jewish exchequer; and other reasons for their increasing wealth may be found in their stubborn loyalty and ready benevolence towards brother Jews. But the rest of the world they confront with the hatred reserved for enemies. They will not feed or intermarry with gentiles. Though a most lascivious people, the Jews avoid sexual intercourse with women of alien race. Among themselves nothing is unlawful. They have introduced the practice of circumcision to show that they are different from others. Proselytes to Jewry adopt the same practices, and the very first lesson they learn is to despise the gods, shed all feelings of patriotism, and consider parents, children and brothers as readily expendable.

Note that the final sentence applies equally to converts of christianity as much as it does to proselytes to jewry. The followers of the “true” god were nothing more than degraded degenerates. At this time, the Romans did not yet strongly distinguish between jews and christians either, so christians cannot use the “But these were jews who rejected christ!” excuse in this instance. Many of them were, and many were not, but both were equally revolting to superior men of our own race. They were regarded as two sides of the same coin, and I would say that this description still largely applies today. Tacitus does briefly mention christians in another work of his, and he regards them in the same way as he does the jews. He rightly refers to them as a malicious cult which spawned from Judaea and spread elsewhere.

Our ancestors who followed the gods were unsullied and joyous. If anyone really thinks our ancestors “needed” christianity to thrive, read this syllogism, and let anyone try to tell me that either of the premises are not true.

Pagan Germanic tribes were not socially degenerate

Those who were not socially degenerate did not need christianity to be orderly and just

Pagan Germanic tribes did not need christianity to be orderly and just

To attempt to refute this would be insanity. The first premise is true, unless you want to think of all your ancestors before the seventh century as degenerates, and the second is true, as long as Jesus “appeared” to the Jews in the first century, and not our Pagan ancestors, who knew nothing of christianity until long after Tacitus was dead. If anyone at all had appeared to the Germans and started acting the way Jesus did, interfering with ancient law and preaching insipid pacifistic platitudes, he would’ve (according to Tacitus) been disposed of in a way fitting for a coward who would dare to tell any man to not punish someone who is clearly deserving of punishment.

“But Jesus told the girl to not do it again! He does not permit sin!”

Oh yeah? And how does that typically work out? Are offenders more likely to cease their crimes if they are physically punished, or if they are let off completely free, and simply told to not do it again? He who takes the latter opinion, is partial to the most unequivocally leftist doctrines ever seen.

Now we will examine verses related to human reproduction. We will see that the new testament presents what is essentially a two thousand year old rendition of today’s increasingly common anti-natalism, which is justified on very spurious moralistic grounds.

1 Corinthians 7:7 (ESV)

I wish that all were as I myself am. But each has his own gift from God, one of one kind and one of another.

Paul here states that his desire is for all men to be like him, a celibate monk living only for the purpose of spreading the “gospel”. He grudgingly accepts that humans reproduce, and permits it alone because even he is not stupid enough to think that his ideas would still spread if he outright banned reproduction. So what does he do instead of banning it? He resentfully permits it, but makes it clear that his wish is for all men to be as barren and infertile as he is. If he had his way, there would not be a single human on earth.

Paul wishes all men to be like him

To be like him is to have no children and never fight anyone

Paul wishes all men to have no children and never fight anyone

Does the conclusion follow necessarily from the premises? It does indeed. With that, we correctly infer that Paul is not masculine, nor is he aristocratic. He is not Indo-European, nor is he noble, admirable, wise, or tolerable in any way. Paul preaches leftism, and we should reject him as we would reject any other preacher of leftism. To anyone who thinks I am taking this verse out of context somehow, I suggest that you read *1 Corinthians* for yourself. He is literally talking about human reproduction immediately before and after the verse I have listed. If you want more proof, observe what he says in the following verse from the very same book.

1 Corinthians 7:8 (ESV)

To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single, as I am.

Is that clear enough? The command of christianity is to not reproduce. Human reproduction is only accepted in christianity as a kind of “necessary evil”. One cannot have too much contempt for this sort of thing. “Oh, but he says we can still have kids!” says the christian reader. Yeah, but he demands kids be raised as christians, if you have them at all. So how wonderful! As long as you teach your kids that infertility is the best option, triune “god” will grudgingly accept that you had them. Problem solved. On this ridiculous matter, I ask the right wing christian, if your god says that you can do A, or B, but that you should ideally do B, why would you then do A? If you actually love your god as you claim, would you not do what he wants you to do? By putting his will over your own? Or could it be that you do not follow his commands because they go completely and utterly against your perfectly healthy biological drives? The command of the christian god is infertility. This fact alone proves that christianity is the 2000 year old predecessor to the disintegrative anti-natalist poison which is swiftly eroding what remains of our civilization today. Christians try to brush this off by stating that Paul also says we are allowed to sometimes disagree with him, whatever that means. I myself cannot recall the supposed verse or verses they are talking about when they bring up this idea that we can actually just pick and choose what writings we do and do not agree with from the allegedly “divinely inspired” Paul himself. When they try to argue this they immediately rip away the foundation from their own core belief that all of their scriptures are divine and correct. If every word of it was correct, then none of it would be open for disagreement. So if christians want to believe that they are allowed to disagree with Paul, it would also logically follow that they are allowed to disagree sometimes with god himself, as long as every single word of the scriptures are written by god. To get out of this, christians would have to concede either that some or all of the scriptures are not divinely inspired, or they can once again flee into intellectual cowardice and throw away all logic by stating that god allowed some false ideas that we are allowed to disagree with to be presented in his own infallible scriptures which are also paradoxically entirely true.

Matthew 5:28 (ESV)

But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

Here the bible sets a new precedent against that of the old Hebrew belief which was much more sane. According to this verse, the simple act of looking, just glancing upon a woman and feeling attracted to her is no different than committing adultery with her. Once again, the idiotic tendency of christians to violate logic, and equalize things which are not equal is on full display. Do we know of any group of effeminate left wing people in modernity today who also try to identify the act of simply looking at women as equivalent with rape? I think so. There is nothing inherently wrong with human reproduction. No matter how often jews, christians, and leftists try to convince us otherwise. To be quite honest, the christians are often the most guilty member of that trio, as it is they who claim that simply desiring to make love is worthy of eternal torture, while the other groups do not. Yes, I am aware that when properly translated, the verse is probably referring to married women, which I can admit makes the verse seem

somewhat more reasonable. Yet, almost all christians, even the fragmentary group of them that actually study their own scriptures diligently, still obstinately insist on applying it to all women, and all the editions of the bible which they promote, and which people actually read, still render the word as “woman” and not “wife”.

Matthew 19:12 (ESV)

For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let the one who is able to receive this receive it.

What does anyone even need to say for this one? It flaunts it's noxious poison in the open. It was not enough for them to just denigrate reproduction, no. They had to go as far as to promote outright physical self-castration, the annihilation of the reproductive organs, as something that men should do. Not just a mere recommendation, but the ideal path for men.

Why? To obtain a supposed “eternal life”... So in other words, for a personal, subjective, meaningless emotional sensation which makes some questionable people temporarily feel good.

So, does this remind us of any groups today? Any left wing groups in particular? Ones who assert that men should take the exact same self-mutilative action, also justified on the meaningless empty grounds of subjective emotional sensations which can be easily proven to be pathological with evidence? Leftists, the successors of christians, spout the very same message as their predecessors, only in an updated form.

No, the verse is not just telling you to be celibate. The common excuse from christians is that this verse is just a metaphor of some kind. If there is one verse in the bible where Jesus is speaking literally, it is this verse. There is no mention at all of camels, mustard seeds, fig trees, mountains, wheat, or chaff here. He is not speaking in the vague and unclear manner that he likes to use when he is talking in metaphors. Even if it was metaphorical, it would only be slightly less poisonous, and he would still be telling a hideous lie, by teaching his followers that being infertile and barren is the best path.

The word used is in fact ‘eunuch’, not ‘virgin’ or anything else. As long as that word, in that verse, is ‘eunuch’, then I am correct, and christians are ancient leftists, who simply haven't updated their antiquated doctrines into modern leftism.

I even checked the original koine Greek, where indeed the word is still ‘eunuch’, and it literally means to castrate, unman, or make oneself a eunuch. It is not mistranslated in any way. Sorry christian morons, people did not just throw this word around in those times as a synonym for ‘single’ either. There is no word which could more clearly describe a physically castrated person in the koine Greek language and vernacular of the first century eastern Roman borderlands other than the one Jesus used in this verse.

So, young right wing christian males, you either submit to me, or you are destroyed. Am I making myself clear? Jesus could have used the word ‘single’ or ‘barren’ if that was what he meant, but he does not do this, because he wanted you and me to be literal eunuchs. There is in fact no possibility for christians to squirm their way out of this one. I can understand right wingers and others being christian when they have never read this verse, or have read it only once and forgotten about it, and have not seen any real explanation of it like the one I have shown. Though if you still at this point find a way to deny

that there is any problem at all, and obstinately claim that this hideous command of self-mutilation is divine and infallible, then you are an utterly worthless coward, and you deserve to be torn apart by lions in an arena.

All right wing men should follow the commands of Jesus

Jesus commands us to cut off our genitals

All right wing men should cut off their genitals

The syllogism above is what is inevitably taught by my christian opponents. So, if right wing christians want to believe that the new testament is true and that the commands of Jesus must be followed, they must also affirm that male self-castration is not only a good thing, but even that the very creator of the universe, who's existence cannot be proven, and who also just so happens to allegedly be a jewish man, has proclaimed it not only as good, but as the ideal path for men to strive towards. I once again ask the right wing christian, if your god commands you to do A, why then do you not do A? If you want to follow your god at absolutely any cost, why then do you not obey his command? The command of your "god" is that you cut off your own genitals. That is what he wants for you. If you fully realize this and still worship him, then you simply deserve to go extinct.

I, as well as many of the more noble of my progenitors have perceived with clarity that these jewish scriptures are false. Not only are they false, but they are in fact objectively proven to be extremely harmful. In the case of this particular verse, when any man decides to undergo self-castration, it succeeds only in making him into a mutilated, impotent, monstrous, and pathetic husk of a half dead creature that can hardly be called a "man". The only circumstance in which this, or any of these verses for that matter would be remotely useful, would be as I said to impose them as a rule on a foreign collective which is very harmful to your own, while your own collective is following a system that is more robust. However, this method of defeating an enemy is extremely cruel and deceptive, and I would say that simple conquest by the sword is more preferable. Even Xerxes, when he had many Greek men castrated on mass after they had been subjugated by his armies, he at least conducted it openly and without deceit. It seems that the ones who would be most likely to use this deceitful method of christianity would be a group that is completely incapable of conquering it's enemies by the sword... Someone like, lets say, members of the very race who are responsible for writing these scriptures and subsequently dispersing them into Europe?

It does not matter if christians say "The bible doesn't promote these things!" if evidence does not back up their claims. I have shown blatantly that the bible does in fact promote decay, inevitably. Whether this was intentional or not does not matter at all. The result of degeneracy is the same.

How dare you retarded christians try to gaslight us, and imply that we are seeing problems which are not there. You think that just because you are cowardly enough to brush off egregious problems, that everyone else should be like you. You think that we are somehow fabricating problems from nothing, and that it is all in our heads. The truth is that it is all in your book, and because your mind is weak, you and other weak minded fools from the past two millennia, many monks, saints, et cetera, have had to convince yourselves that these verses don't mean what they clearly say. You cling to a poisonous falsehood, due to a combination of mental fearfulness and low IQ.

"Oh, we don't teach that, even though that is clearly what the verse says! Just ignore the blatant evidence before your eyes and listen to my ridiculous singsong voice tell you that you should still adore the verse even though it is obviously disgusting and life-denying!"

I am tired of hearing these low IQ imbeciles defend the indefensible.

Hey idiots – you do teach that. If your book says that, and you promote the book as perfect, then guess what – you, teach that. Whether you admit it or not. If we can all read it in plain English, and it still says the exact same thing in plain koine Greek (which it practically always does), then the verse teaches that. You can bring up saint A and theologian B as much as you want, it does not help your case. As long as you do not renounce these hideous verses entirely, or alter them to the point where they do not mean what they originally said, then you still have irreconcilable problems, and you are still directly promoting leftist moralism.

“Oh, but right before he tells you to become a eunuch, he is talking about marriage! See? He does support human reproduction and traditional patriarchal aristocracy!”

Wrong again, right wing christians. This really isn’t the rock solid refutation that you think it is.

“But he likes marriage so much, that he banned all divorce except for in cases of muh adultery!”

Now, let me explain to you why the way he altered marriage actually advanced leftism directly, and deeply damaged the robust patriarchal system which existed in Europe before the forceful imposition of christianity. Firstly, let’s look at what Jesus actually said about marriage immediately before he told us to cut off our genitals.

Matthew 19:3-11 (ESV)

And Pharisees came up to him and tested him by asking, “Is it lawful to divorce one’s wife for any cause?” He answered, “Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, ‘Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh’? So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate.” They said to him, “Why then did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce and to send her away?” He said to them, “Because of your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you: whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another, commits adultery.” The disciples said to him, “If such is the case of a man with his wife, it is better not to marry.” But he said to them, “Not everyone can receive this saying, but only those to whom it is given.

The average double-digit IQ young christian right winger that reads those lines will think “Ah hah! See? He is defending marriage as something that is good, regardless of what he says in the next verse.”

This merely lacks perspective, and the error derives from the failure to understand the social situation of Europe in antiquity, and how it differed from our own disastrous situation that christianity has caused.

From our own eyes, today, in our western world where women have obtained one-hundred percent of the power within social situations and marital dynamics, the verse appears to be patriarchal, as it superficially forbids divorce.

But the world of the first century was very different compared to the world of today. During ancient times, in both Judea and Europe, men held all social and marital power over women, who had little or no power of their own. Only men could decide to get divorced, and women had no say at all in the matter. For the Romans, in early times, it was even completely legal for the paterfamilias, the father of the family, to inflict capital punishment over his family if they were deserving of it (the severity of this law waned as time went on, though the paterfamilias never lost complete control over his household). This was a patriarchy in its most true form. Now, it is important to realize that Europe never collapsed because of an epidemic of patriarchs randomly murdering their families (and unjust familicide was possibly the worst crime that one could commit in the ancient Pagan cultures of Europe). In fact, I can recall zero instances in which this actually happened. If it did take place at all, it seems that it was not often, and the many families of Europe largely thrived under this patriarchal system, a system which was held together by authoritative, disciplined, and responsible men who had legalistic authority over their wives. These men loved their families, and they understood as ancient monarchs did in regard to their kingdoms, that there is no inherent contradiction within the act of restricting something that you love for the sake of its protection. We know that today, when women have obtained power, we can observe them fiscally and emotionally destroying their entire families at every opportunity, like clockwork, and we also observe them killing millions of their own children every year, mostly within the womb, but in many cases outside of it as well. This is simply due to the biological differences between men and women, men are more responsible and emotionally calm, demonstrably. Women generally operate mentally more on fevered, blind intuition, instead of cold and masculine rationality. This is due to adaptation, as women are evolved firmly towards taking care of the home, protecting small children who are helpless, fitting in with the collective that provides resources and safety to them, and most strongly, for latching onto the strongest mate that they can, even if that means abandoning their own children which came from a previous mate. These facts of nature are immutable, and cannot be destroyed by human free will, whether the attempt is made through effeminate religion which denies the reality of human nature, or any form of leftism which also denies the reality of human nature.

So, the Romans and other Europeans were aware of these realities, and so they knew the truth, which is that for a state to be powerful and patriarchal, it must absolutely restrict the freedom of its female subjects, while legalistically favouring men. All power must go to the aristocratic hydra of the patriarchy, else we end up with what we now have. It is either ancient and indestructible Leviathan, enacted by legalistic force, or it is the egalitarian feminist hellscape of today. If you take away the power of men, then women will fill that empty space and take power for themselves.

With these realities in mind, we can better see how Jesus did not, in fact, enforce marriage, or patriarchal rulership, but rather, he initiated the ongoing assault on aristocratic patriarchy within Europe, an assault that is now culminating. The rise of feminism did not magically begin in 1965. It began when Jesus mutilated our ancestral patriarchal laws. We see that what he effectively did was remove the power of a man over his own household, and place that power within the hands of women, along with the subterranean and despicable church bureaucracy. By forbidding men to divorce their wives, an act which would leave the divorced woman socially isolated and vulnerable in antiquity, he actually removed a large degree of female accountability, and he heavily reduced their incentive to be obedient wives and good mothers. Under the reforms of the church, women could now be terrible wives and mothers, and the husband could not divorce her, but was forced to keep supporting her. Jesus also raised the power of

women by abolishing any punishment for adultery, which is and has always been committed by women far more frequently than by men.

Actions matter infinitely more than words, Christians. If someone merely says “You shouldn’t do that!”, but then does nothing at all to prevent the perpetrator from doing that, then they allowed it. If they don’t stop it, they allow it. That is how it works. “Oh, but Jewbus doesn’t permit sin!” Shut up moron. If he does nothing at all to stop it, then he allows it. You make the same critique against gun free zones in your own country, saying correctly that they do nothing to actually reduce crime because they merely use words instead of tangible force, but when it comes to your fictional god, you defend this very same egregious defect whenever he displays it. “But Christianity does have a punishment for people in muh hell!”

If you are low IQ enough to fall for that pitiful cope, then you cannot be helped by this work. Making up a fake imaginary punishment does not substitute real punishment which is demonstrably effective. Not to mention the fact that this obscene, eternal fake punishment cope is absolutely despicable to any sane person, who is not the common aspergers syndrome afflicted right wing Christian that has absolutely no empathy for other humans, due to his mental illness. I get it, right wing Christians. Your defective and autistic mind despises reality and wants everyone who was mean to you to be tortured forever. But just because you want your cowardly and pathetic cope to exist, that does not mean that it does exist. Your claim has no more truth to it than that of the average mentally ill man who says he is a woman because he feels like it – which is to say no truth at all. You both suffer from defective minds, and so you flee into your own degenerate fictions.

Sorry morons – you don’t get to us the “Ermz, ppl sendz themselvz to muh hell!!! Jeebus never sendz them!!!” excuse. Not in reality, that is, the world that cannot be altered by these pathetic desires of your autistic mind. Is God in full control of all things at all times? If the answer is yes, then no one has free will, and no one chooses anything at all. Maybe if you didn’t suffer from autism, you might also realize that literally nobody in this world wants to bring hell onto themselves. The reason many people reject your cult so effortlessly is not because they somehow want to be harmed, rather it is because they are not autistic social outcasts like most young Christian right wingers. If “God” causes all things and allows the devil to exist, and the devil does anything at all after that, then “God” is literally and objectively the one who causes and allows whatever the devil does. To deny this is to deny any coherence to reality at all. I return to where I digressed, back to discussing something that does actually exist, which is the dire consequences of your vile cult.

Now, Jesus did not just remove male power, no. He actually already put marital power in the hands of women, long before the 1960s, or the industrial revolution. This is due to the fact that when he removes male power by forbidding them to divorce their wives, he allows for just one condition in which it is acceptable, the reason being adultery.

It is demonstrably true that the one committing adultery in a relationship is usually a woman, and it is also true that the male is far more likely to be humiliated and to end the marriage because of it. Women are also vastly more likely to be the initiators of divorce than men are. Anyone who denies this is just coping. So, we observe that Jesus basically did remove any power from men, and gave it all to women, because the woman could now initiate a divorce and break up her family if she felt like it, all she had to do was commit adultery, which is extremely easy to do for women, but not so much for most men. The adultery engaged in by the woman in those times would no longer be punished either. Because the church in late antiquity and the middle ages was more supportive of single women than the old Pagan structure, the divorced woman would be much less vulnerable socially and financially. It is a simple fact

that many women were happy to remain single and occasionally fornicate with alpha males instead of being restricted in a marriage with an average guy back then in late antiquity, and even more women are happy to do the same thing today, as this is their nature, and our modern laws have simply amplified egalitarian christian values, and made women even more free.

In the historical narrative portion of this book, we will see that the birth rates have been lower, and the frequency of adultery has been higher in western Europe than most other places in the world not since 1965, but since the middle ages. Why? Because of christianity, or, as it is more properly titled, proto-leftism.

So there you have it. Jesus didn't defend patriarchy or marriage. He mutilated both of those things. In the verse, when we see that the people listening to him rightly told him that what he was saying would make marriage completely untenable, what did Jesus do? He doubled down on his obscene commands, and told his followers to cut off their genitals if they didn't want to enter a marriage in which the woman held all of the power over the man. What a despicable imbecile.

There is one more noteworthy verse in which marriage is the topic. From this verse we see how the christian system absolutely disdains human breeding and sexuality, and only sees those things as necessary evils at best.

Matthew 22:23-30 (ESV)

The same day Sadducees came to him, who say that there is no resurrection, and they asked him a question, saying, "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies having no children, his brother must marry the widow and raise up offspring for his brother.' Now there were seven brothers among us. The first married and died, and having no offspring left his wife to his brother. So too the second and third, down to the seventh. After them all, the woman died. In the resurrection, therefore, of the seven, whose wife will she be? For they all had her." But Jesus answered them, "You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.

So christian right wingers, if your god really does value marriage like you say, then why is marriage completely non-existent in heaven? Kinda odd, don't you think? Kinda odd, that your god who supposedly loves marriage so much would make his perfect eternal afterlife completely absent of marriage, with all of his most faithful believers becoming "like the angels", the "angels" who early christians considered to be genderless? That is, if the faithful did not already make themselves eunuchs in life, as Jesus directly commanded them to do. How can you even be surprised at all of the questionable people who now preach from your pulpits? You deserve them, and your book directly endorses them.

So just stop coping. Snap out of it, spit it out, get over it, and move on. Be better. Stop being retarded. Throw this christian filth in the trash where it belongs. Have some backbone. I am tired to death of all the spinelessness and low IQ that is evident among young right wingers. We have to be more lethal, and we have to be more intelligent. One cannot have lethality or sagacity along with christianity. So just snap out of your trance, it's pathetic. But by all means, if you are just too stupid and fearful, cling to your semitic cult, and all of these disgusting verses which I have exhibited. You will merely remain a pathetic

and infertile virgin for the rest of your life, talking to your imaginary friend and watching porn, ever crumbling further and further into psychological disintegration, you contemptible coward. Renounce your jewish deceivers or perish. Take heed of my warning, and internalize it. I can understand right wingers remaining christians out of mere ignorance or complacency, but for one who has read this book and still remains subservient to the corpse of the jew, there is no excuse in the world, and if you are that thing, then you deserve the dire consequences that will inevitably be inflicted upon you. You will rot alone, and you will not be remembered. He who tries to ignore my words will be wasted.

So this concludes the main selection of material from the bible which prevents me from being a christian. But keep in mind, I am only listing the most egregious and malicious of verses which directly attack violence and sex. There is a vast multitude of other blatantly stupid verses which I could've gone over, 'give all of your possessions to the poor', 'take no thought for your life', et cetera.

Here I have proven beyond any shadow of a doubt that the new testament inevitably promotes, either intentionally or implicitly, false ideals of pacifism, anti-natalism, anti-rationalism, and anti-naturalism. In other words, it supports the identical philosophical values (those which can truly be called inherently left wing) that leftists today promote, and it does so without one shred of proof for its pathetically stupid claims, also in the same manner that leftists do. The only difference between christians and the left, is that the left likes to mask itself with a thin veneer of "science", while maintaining pacifistic, cosmopolitan, and egalitarian core values which originate from idealistic christianity, and are anything but rational or naturalistic.

The strangling restriction and denigration of natural things like violence and sex that christianity and liberalism has imposed upon us is nothing new either. It originates in the east, like christianity does. Plato reveals this to us in his *Symposium*, where he reveals the Persian restrictions upon their Greek subjects in Ionia against love, physical prowess, and philosophy. These curtailments were in no way different than what has occurred due to the imposition of christianity over our race, christianity, which mutilates our ancient system of marriage, while saying that physical exercise is "unto little profit", and putting philosophy next to "empty deceit".

But in Ionia and many other places elsewhere, for as many as live under foreign rule, it is considered shameful. For it is owing to their tyrannies that foreigners think this is shameful, along with the pursuit of philosophy and physical exercise; for I don't think it's in the rulers' interest that big ideas should be engendered among the subjects, nor strong friendships and associations, which all the other activities, but especially love, tend to bring about. Our tyrants here too learned from this experience, for it was Aristogeiton's love and Harmodius' friendship, when both grew steadfast, which destroyed their rule. Thus where it has been laid down that it is shameful to gratify lovers, it is established by the bad character of those who made the laws, the greed of the rulers and the cowardliness of their subjects.

The left has simply amplified these vile restrictions against nature one-hundred fold. Autistic christians who do nothing but pray, play video games, and watch porn all day seem to have a false idea that sex and violence are somehow rampant in the west. The truth is that both of those things are statistically and demonstrably more uncommon among us than ever before, thanks to feminism and liberalism, the direct offshoots of christianity. Right wing christians contribute to this disaster because they fail to see how their own doctrines inherently inculcate leftist values which go against the true values of our ancient forefathers, who are superior to us.

In nature, and in the old European Pagan ways of thought, lovemaking, aristocratic pride, passion, adventure, deified war and conquest, submission of women under men, hierarchies, death by the sword, just revenge, love of the natural world, prejudice, discrimination, and pathos of distance, are all good things. Yet buddhism, gnosticism, zoroastrianism, islam, sikhism, dialectical marxism, new age pacifism, vulgar liberalism, and christianity, all slander the truth in unison, and say that those naturally harmonious things, are “evil”.

Even if this was a hypothetical world, where all of the verses I listed were merely “misinterpreted” by me, then why would we even want to promote a spurious book which has all of these incredibly stupid sounding verses that would inevitably require lengthy and verbose essays to neutralize? The prospect is beyond absurd. But that is merely an imaginary world. In real life, I have made no such misinterpretation. I’ve seen the verses for what they really are, which is idiotic, unsound, poisonous, and worthless opinions, written down in all likelihood by cowardly, dishonest, mentally and physically deprived, sentimentally fanatical rodents hiding away in some dimly lit cave or hovel within the eastern borderlands of the Roman Empire. Perhaps these cowards unconscious motive for spreading this poison was to cause their thriving European conquerors to become just as miserable and deprived as they themselves, that is (mainly) the Jews were, which they had been at least since their utter destruction at the hands of the superior Romans, not to mention the carousel of other empires that had dominated the Jews in rapid succession during earlier times.

Within the next portion of this work, I will shift my focus from the flaws of the christian god, to the flaws of his followers. I will discuss the very origins of christianity, and engage in an objective examination of it’s effect on Europe and Europeans, to see if it was really so beneficial as so many right wing christians would like to claim. After this, I will examine our degenerate nations of today, and reveal that they have never been more thoroughly christian.

II: The followers of the christian god

Here and elsewhere we shall not obtain the best insight into things until we actually see them growing from the beginning.

-Aristotle, Politics

Something that nearly all seem to agree on is that the origins of christianity are shrouded in obscurity. The christian view is that the gospel accounts are accurate, but as I have already pointed out, this is false. The books not only contradict each other, but they also describe physically impossible events. In addition to this, the advanced Greek language of the manuscripts does not point to authorship at the hands of illiterate Galilean peasants. At the very least, they must have been using scribes who knew how to add weight and style to their spoken stories, but I think it more likely that most of the books in the new testament which are not the Pauline epistles are simply pseudonymous. The evidence seems to point to these books being created by educated people, who were well familiar with the old testament, but wanted to formulate something new for their own purposes, by fusing elements of the old testament with more dualistic strains of thought, mainly Persian zoroastrianism. There is good evidence that this syncretic view was already starting to take form several centuries before, and was crystallized in the form of the new testament.

Leftists sometimes spout the theory that christianity was created by the Roman government to better control the Jews, and to increase Rome's power. But this theory does not make sense, because christianity from the earliest times was mainly foisted onto non-jews, even if many of them were semitic people of similar origin. This theory is also questionable due to the fact that christianity only succeeded in severely weakening Rome and all of Europe itself.

Among the non-christian right wing, some think that christianity sprouted organically, and that Jesus was indeed a real person and a jewish reformer, a spouter of slave morality, though not a miraculous being.

I cannot say for certain exactly what it's true origins are, but I personally believe that the strongest theory is that it was concocted deliberately, and implemented calculatedly, by a group of people with malicious motives, whose goal was to weaken, harm, and pacify the Roman empire and Europeans generally. Of which specific sect I cannot say, though it was possibly the dualistic jewish essenes, who were very literate, and who hated the Roman Empire. Perhaps it was some other group adjacent to them. I do not necessarily take the opinion that a group created it and carefully watched over it up until the present day, rather, I think it more likely that the sect of people who created it probably faded away at some point before they could see it's fruits. Whatever the specific group was, and whether this poison was inculcated intentionally or not, there is no question that the creators of christianity were semitic in origin. Regarding Jesus himself, there are very many good reasons to doubt his existence. I believe that the existence of many liberal-esque jewish reformers during that time is a certainty, and that one or multiple of these reformers was probably the inspiration for the Jesus character found in the gospels.

Enough about the speculative origins of the thing. I will now examine the early church that christians praise so much, the early church which all christians claim is best represented by their

particular denomination. Who exactly were the early christians? Where were they from? And what were they like? How exactly did they behave?

The epistles suspiciously are mostly addressed to Europeans, and in the case of Galatians to an ethnically Celtic people residing in central Anatolia. Despite this, the early church by all accounts was not initially very successful in Europe, but found much more acceptance in Africa and the middle east. The demographic which most welcomed it, was the urbanite underclasses. Marginalized groups like prostitutes, non-European immigrants, slaves, and eunuchs were especially enthusiastic towards it, and in the new testament itself we see that one of the very first converts was an african eunuch. This fact is no surprise to me, as this seems to be the target audience of the gospels. Rootless, resentful, diseased, defeated, conquered, enslaved, pathetic. These are the allegedly blessed ones of christianity, and of modern leftism, so no one at all should be shocked that these were the very people that championed christianity during its onset. The early church gained favour among these classes in the same manner that modern leftists do – that is through constant financial donations. Low minded urbanites were also very attracted to christianity because it required no effort at all to engage in the religion. In the old Pagan system, to gain the favour of the gods, one had to offer a sacrifice of something valuable, an animal, wine, incense, or other precious things. In christianity there were no standards at all. Just babble about how great Jesus supposedly is, and you have his favour. As long as you keep doing this, no crime was off limits. The only unforgivable thing in their system, was to leave the newfangled cult and go back to the ancestral ways. Christianity also offered people eternal pleasure after death at no cost at all, and Paganism did not make such an absurd offer. If the christian ever messed up, he would simply be forgiven, even if he continued in the exact same transgression over and over again, while paganism did not engage in that specious cycle that autistic christians love so much. This judaic cult was blatantly constructed to infect the impious dregs of society. The faction of Roman society which had the most disdain for the christians was the Roman army, and during the times before Constantine, the church was overwhelmingly pacifistic by all accounts.

The early christians were regarded usually with apathetic suspicion, as being just another eastern cult of the urban rabble, which is what they were. Sometimes however, pagans caught on to their machinations, and punished christians for their crimes. The subterranean and despicable nature of christianity was not yet masked with a false veneer of aged wisdom, and during the reign of the most wise and noble emperors in the history of the Roman empire, many christians were reprimanded and killed for their behaviours. These wretched urbanites that composed the early church were known for their vile debauchery and lasciviousness, namely through their cannibalistic orgies which were held amongst them at night. These acts were not merely the acts of the Egyptian gnostic Carpocratian sect, as christians today may claim. The words of Justin Martyr prove that these accusations had already been levelled against the christians well before the obscure Carpocratian sect came into existence. Justin Martyr denies any involvement on the part of his own faction, but does not even deny that other christians were engaging in such acts.

Whether or not those people commit those shameful and fabulous acts – the putting out the lights, the indulging of promiscuous intercourse, and eating human flesh – I know not.

In locations across the empire, in Gaul, Italy, and the east, charges of these specific acts were brought against christians. The christians were placed on trial before competent and devoted tribunals and found guilty, and then they were justly punished with severity. Much of the persecutions that were enacted were unquestionably due to the hideous degeneracy that the early christians engaged in, and not

due to the gentle and just emperors of Pax Romana having an irrational fear of truth. It is in fact christians who possess this fear.

But not all of the early christians were vile, illiterate, semitic rabble. Some were educated, and they were capable of fleshing out their doctrines so that the system they professed could become more organized and advance itself in power. Christians who bother to study the history of their belief will be familiar with two names, Tertullian and Origen. This pair exists in an odd place within the minds of christian theologians. Tertullian himself is actually the first known person to ever refer to god as a 'trinity', and they both seem to be among the earliest of the christian writers who wrote anything more than rather basic narratives and epistles, yet they are not canonized, or considered to be fully orthodox teachers by most chalcedonian christians. Despite this, they are also not completely demonized or reviled as ferocious demoniacal heretics, like Arius or Photinus are. Christians seem to have a positive, though cautious view of Tertullian and Origen, but something christians and secular academics can agree upon is that these two men were among the most, if not the most influential and prolific of all the pre-nicene christian writers.

Right wing christians often flaunt and laud these writers and their writings, and they see it as some kind of proof that christianity was led by nobles of indo-european descent from the very start. But I can very easily demolish this view. Yes, these two writers are today known by Latin names. But that alone cannot assure us that they were European in origin. Tertullian was a Carthaginian. That fact itself is suspicious, but it is not enough to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was a semite. Some say his father was actually a Roman centurion, but even if this is true, it is important for us to realize that semites are more matriarchal than we are, and they often consider the mother to be the parent who's ethnicity is inherited by the child. Thankfully, in his work he is more than happy to tell us who he really is. According to Tertullian, he himself is a "*Poenicum inter Romanos*", in Latin meaning a "*Punic among Romans*". These lines come from an essay of his, in which he defends his decision of refusing to continue wearing the Roman toga, in favour of a more comfortable garment that was worn in his beloved Africa during the days before the Roman conquest and destruction of Carthage.

I managed to put myself through the displeasure of reading that entire essay of his. To say the least, it is basically a thinly veiled polemic of resentment against Indo-Europeans themselves, saturated with his personal aversions towards all things Roman. He associates the toga with blond haired Scipio, the conqueror of Africa, as well as anyone who is "unclean" in his eyes, though for him that simply means noble romans who spend their wealth on magnificent art, people who devote their lives to martial prowess, people who make love and experience romance, and generally anyone who isn't a resentful pathetic weakling like Tertullian himself is.

Tertullian also explains that the Roman toga just isn't "practical" enough, and that his native garment is more quick and easy to put on and take off. We will see this general theme much more with christians throughout this portion of my polemic, that is the desire for cheap and facile comfort overtaking effort and striving. Near the end of his essay, there is a line in which he describes the exact statement he is trying to make by rejecting the toga in favour of the pre-roman garment.

It is astoundingly cowardly, laughable, and revealing of his character. Really, his whole essay could be condensed into this single line:

I do not act as a judge, a soldier, or a king: I have withdrawn from public life. My only activity concerns myself; I do not have any care, except for this: to have no care.

Not only his essay, but christianity in general is well summarized by this line from its most devoted follower. In another work of his, he writes words which display his seething resentment for all things Indo-European, and in true christian fashion, he invents a childish fantasy in which everyone that he does not like, in this case, Europeans, receives eternal torment, while he gets to laugh along with any other pathetic slaves who were as worthless as he was. If you are a right wing christian, take special observance here. This is what the people you kneel before think about you, your blood, your folk, your culture, your history, and your being. You think the church is corrupt now and that it was better before? Think again. The early church was even more repulsive then what now exists. Observe how the early christians felt about your people.

What a city in the new Jerusalem! For it will not be without its games; it will have the final and eternal day of judgment, which the Gentiles now treat with unbelief and scorn, when so vast a series of ages, with all their productions, will be hurled into one absorbing fire. How magnificent the scale of that game! With what admiration, what laughter, what glee, what triumph shall I perceive so many mighty monarchs, who had been given out as received into the skies, even Jove himself and his votaries, moaning in unfathomable gloom. The governors too, persecutors of the Christian name, cast into fiercer torments than they had devised against the faithful, and liquefying amid shooting spires of flame! And those sage philosophers, who had deprived the Deity of his offices, and questioned the existence of a soul, or denied its future union with the body, meeting again with their disciples only to blush before them in those ruddy fires! Not to forget the poets, trembling, not before the tribunal of Rhadamanthus or Minos, but at the unexpected bar of Christ! Then is the time to hear tragedians, doubly pathetic now that they bewail their own agonies; to observe the actors, released by the fierce elements from all restraint upon their gestures; to admire the charioteer, glowing all over on the car of torture; to watch the wrestlers, thrust into the struggles, not of the gymnasium, but of the flames.

This is who you side with if you are christian. Someone who wishes for you and all members of your race that ever lived, to be tortured eternally, while he watches and laughs with slaves, eunuchs, prostitutes, and foreigners who obeyed him. He literally called you a 'gentile' and told you that he wants every aspect of your ancient heritage to be destroyed. So, it's time to stop cucking for Jeebus, morons. Snap out of it. No one can blame me for my harsh words, especially against such a poisonous threat. We are only just getting started, but if you still are too cowardly to abandon the jewish god, then know that the worst is yet to come, and that the behaviour of christians does not by any means get better onwards from this point of the narrative. Tertullian merely fantasized about destroying Europe, but his successors actually did their very best to act out his fantasy.

No one can be surprised that this "man" Tertullian would gladly reject the Indo-European gods of old Latium who had ruthlessly conquered his precious Carthage. Elsewhere in his work, we see that he advocated for no one to read pagan literature at all, and for the only belief in existence to be braindead, idiotic, blind faith. Unfortunately for Tertullian, the Europeans, this time as the heretical arian Germanic Vandals would conquer and subjugate his own Africa once again, not long after it had finally fully been brought into trinitarianism. Christianity did reign for many centuries, but we have now regained the ability to trample over Tertullians warped jewish form of "divinity". Much of the old Greco-Roman pagan literature which he wanted to destroy has also survived, ironically due to his own christian monks in the middle ages copying the manuscripts down to read themselves, or sell for financial gain, those who bought these books were mainly the nobility of Europe, seemingly more interested in reading Greco-Roman literature than anything that Jesus or his offspring Tertullian had to say.

Now regarding Origen. He, like Tertullian and the seeming majority of notable early christian theologians, was a dweller of Africa. However, he was a resident of Alexandria, and not Carthage. A notable parallel between Origen and Tertullian is that both may have been the product of upper class Greco-Roman men breeding local native peasant women. Origen's father by the earliest accounts was a Greek man, though his mother seems to have been an Egyptian local who did not have citizen status within the empire. Though even if Origen was a pure blooded Greek, the philosophy and way of life he promoted is fully in line with the newfangled and idealistic schools of thought that were breaking out everywhere in Alexandria during those days.

As a young man, Origen was taken in by a wealthy gnostic woman, who was also funding an influential gnostic teacher in that area, who frequently lectured in her home. Despite this, he seems to have not (at least nominally) left the orthodox faction during his life, though it is very clear to any discerning mind that the orthodox faction itself merely presents an exoteric, watered down form of gnosticism.

Origen was a firm and uncompromising pacifist. He maintained the biblical view that participating in earthly wars was against the way of Christ, and it was impossible for any christian to participate in any such war without compromising their faith, since christ had blatantly forbidden all forms of violence for his followers. He went as far as to profess that if everyone was as peaceful and loving as the christians were, then there would be no wars at all, and no need for any militaries either. The problem with this kind of universalizing dogma is that it is retarded, and has the opposite effect that it claims. The only poor fellows who have the heart to actually follow this kind of teaching are sensitive and gentle types, people such as myself back when I was nineteen years old. So they follow it, and only weaken themselves, while consequently it is the malicious degenerates who find themselves empowered and enabled, with free reign to tyrannize over pathological pacifists as they please.

Origen is most known by christians for his supposed "refutation" of Celsus, a skillful Pagan writer who was one of the first to write against the newfangled judaic sect that was spreading among the vulgar classes of many imperial cities. Origen's insufferable babbling of a refutation ultimately boils down to nothing more than pathetic appeals to faith against the truth of reality, this intolerable stupidity being the foundation of all leftism. Celsus put forward a more plausible and likely version of the new testament narrative, that Mary was simply an adulterous jewish woman, who had cuckolded her husband by having a child with a Roman soldier named Pantera, and that this child was sent away to be a labourer in Egypt, where he learned his mystical doctrine. A Roman tombstone has been discovered, which dates precisely to the time of the supposed life of Jesus, and this tombstone bears the name of one Tiberius Julius Abdes Pantera. The tombstone also indicates that this soldier was from Sidon, which is quite close to Galilee. Celsus also points out that the christians in his time were intensely dishonest, constantly altering and modifying their own scriptures. His words have been vindicated, as we now know that many crucial passages of the new testament were interpolations. The trinitarian verse in John, the ending of Mark, et cetera. Even christians currently agree that these were not present in the oldest manuscripts. I would personally contend that the texts themselves are likely wholly fabricated or only partially based in real events, as there is no good reason to believe that they are any more than a few decades older than all of the "apocryphal" works like *The Shepherd of Hermas* et cetera which did not make it into the new testament, despite being widely read by christians.

Celsus criticizes both jews and christians in his work *The True Word*, which is what Origen attempted to refute. There is a quote from Celsus in that work which I find extremely insightful, and he explains in detail what may be the biggest folly of all that we find in jews and their offspring, a monstrous deformation of reason that is responsible for so much desolation and depravity. This is the naïve and

idiotic solipsism which states without evidence that humans are somehow above nature, and that animals are simply nothing more than lifeless machines, not like us in any way, we who are supposedly “divine” in a way that somehow supersedes nature. From this abomination follows foolishness and ignorance at best, but more commonly it produces abject degeneracy, for it allows the human to simply brush off any inhibition or sane reasoning, under the justification that we are somehow “above” nature and thus immune to natural law. All the while this goes on, these moronic imbeciles occlude the truth, by asserting that “nature” or “animalism” is actually the source of depravity, and not the mind-eroding filth which they have adopted and promote ceaselessly. This philosophy is undoubtedly what leads to both communism as well as capitalism. The mass torture facilities which are animal skin farms in china and our own factory farming industries both stem from the idea that animals are just stupid evil robots without free will and that they are only there for us to use, and us precious humans are “above” them and can do what we please, because of our so-called “libertarian free will” and “dominion” over them.

“But god made the animals too, and we don’t hate them.”

You may not, but the doctrines that you hold to inculcate the hatred of them inevitably. So, you can either be a Pagan or naturalist, or you can remain in the judeo-christian-capitalist camp. It is one or the other, and you can’t have it both ways. Maybe consider joining the side that doesn’t tell you to cut off your genitals, okay? You got that? Would it really be such a difficult task to just join our side?

Celsus was still alive and lived to see the glories of antiquity. He never had the displeasure of seeing what christianity and jews would make of the world, but he still was able to perceive the threat at hand, and this quote from him shows us that our people were not totally oblivious to the threat that was taking form.

The race of Jews and Christians, are all of them like to a flight of bats or to a swarm of ants issuing out of their nest, or to frogs holding council in a marsh, or to worms crawling together in the corner of a dunghill, and quarrelling with one another as to which of them were the greater sinners, and asserting that God shows and announces to themselves all things beforehand; and that, abandoning the whole world, and the regions of heaven, and this great earth, he becomes a citizen among themselves alone, and to themselves alone makes his intimations, and does not cease sending and inquiring, in what way they may be associated with him for ever. They are like worms which assert that there is a God, and that immediately after him, we who are made by him are altogether like unto God; and that all things have been made subject to us,—earth, and water, and air, and stars,—and that all things exist for our sake, and are ordained to be subject to us. The worms—that is, they themselves—say that now, since certain amongst us commit sin, God will come to us or will send his son to consume the wicked with fire, that the rest of us may have eternal life with him.

The solipsistic hatred of nature was no problem for Origen, however. According to the early christian writer Eusebius, Origen was one of the christians who was truly devoted to Christ, as he actually went through with the act of making himself a eunuch, in submission to the very clear command of Christ.

So indeed that was Origen, the half Egyptian radical pacifist who cut off his own genitals to submit to the teachings of a liberalizing jewish revolutionary that probably never existed.

“But these men are only deceitful heretics! You leave out the teachings of the orthodox fathers because you know that their views are patriarchal, robust, and uncompromisingly masculine!” Says the right wing christian.

Ah yes, the fathers of the orthodox faction. Do not worry. Be patient, and have no fear. I will destroy them soon enough. The reason I mention these other men first, is because they came before your beloved orthodox christians and church fathers, though not only did they precede them, but they tutored them, fraternized with them, and aligned themselves with them while they were still breathing. Had they been true heretics par excellence, their works would not have been well preserved like they are today, but would’ve ended up being completely destroyed, which is the fate that befell the writings of all the arian, semi-arian, eunomian, and photinian sects, who’s crime in the eyes of the orthodox faction it seems was merely trying to add a slight hint of rationality and harmony into an incoherent doctrine of obnoxious naivety. I must remind you that it was Tertullian who taught your own Cyprian, the orthodox bishop of Carthage, and it was Cyprian who was a great influence on, and the predecessor of Augustine. Likewise with Origen, it was Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Caesarea, and your most precious Athanasius who were his direct philosophical offspring.

Since I cannot discuss every single christian saint in this work, I will now focus on the two which are arguably the most beloved and venerated by devout christians and right wing christians alike. These are Athanasius, and Augustine. I will also discuss the christian emperors here, because their actions are closely intertwined with that of the church fathers.

Christians of every variety have nothing but love and positivity for Athanasius of Alexandria. In order for us to understand Athanasius at all, we must also understand the circumstances of the Roman Empire at the time of his life. We are now getting into the fourth century, and the judaic cult of christianity has at this point had plenty of time to develop and grow in organization and influence among the marginalized urbanite underclasses of the Roman eastern and African provinces, while to a smaller degree also existing in some of the western cities. This era saw the first christian emperor, Constantine, a man of meagre accomplishment as far as emperors go, but having gained much admiration from christians simply because he was the first emperor to share their belief. The circumstances of his sudden conversion are peculiar to say the least, and the fanciful legend of his pre-battle conversion on the outskirts of Rome can easily be proven false. This story, in which the triune “god” itself supposedly gave him the order to nobly slaughter and defeat his own fellow Romans under the sign of Christ, his victory shortly followed by a conversion, is disproven by the evidence at hand. A triumphal arch erected by him after the battle still stands today, and it bears zero mention of christianity, while it uses explicitly Pagan imagery. Numismatics show us that coins minted under his authority for many years after this battle took place still bear the names and images of Pagan deities on them, which was the normal manner in which imperial coinage was issued before the christian emperors. We do not start seeing christian imagery on his coinage until well after the battle of the Milvian Bridge. So why in reality did he suddenly convert to a newfangled Asiatic urbanite cult and abandon his ancestral heritage? There are several primary sources from late antiquity that describe his life and behaviour, and by comparing them we can deduce what most likely happened. Constantine had murdered his wife, and his own son, nobody denies this. The reason for the killings is that evidently Constantine the “Great” had been cuckolded, and plotted to have them both murdered, out of jealous rage. The woman he was married to, Fausta, was much younger than he was, and was closer in age to his son, Crispus (who was not related by blood to Fausta, but was Constantine’s son by another woman). At the time of the murders, Fausta was only in her 30s, and Crispus was in either his late 20s or early 30s, while Constantine was now rather old, in his late 50s or early 60s. Because of this, it is quite natural for there to have been romantic feelings going on between Crispus and Fausta, and we can

also believe that their affair was not a one time thing, but quite prolonged, as they almost always are among married women who take younger lovers in place of their older and busier husbands. Another thing to take into account here is that Fausta was the sister of Constantine's rival Maxentius. Both Fausta and Maxentius were the children of Maximian, who was one of the tetrarchs that reigned before Constantine. Constantine killed Maximian and Maxentius both, and so we can expect his young wife Fausta probably would not be very incentivized to remain faithful to an aging man who murdered her father and her brother.

This act, the act of killing your own family, though completely forgivable and the act of the triune god himself according to Christians, was not taken lightly within the ancestral Pagan beliefs which had reigned for untold eons before Constantine. In fact, there simply was no greater crime, no atrocity more severe, then brutally killing your own family as Constantine did. Of course, earlier in Roman times the father of the household did have power to inflict capital punishment, though this was not common at all, and only for cases of true disgrace, and not for cases where a man's second wife, who is thirty years younger than the man happens to cheat on the man. For one to commit an act of unjust familicide, it would inevitably mean facing severe punishment in Hades after death. Constantine, realizing this, sought a new religion that could absolve him of the ultimate crime, and the serpent-tongued Christian bishops who dwelled and preached in Transtiberium, the multicultural underclass neighbourhood of Rome, were more than happy to give him exactly what he desired.

So he not only abandoned the belief of his ancestors, but he abandoned Rome itself. Setting out for the east, where he certainly would've felt more at home, he decided to found an entirely new city, at a new location, one as close to Asia as one can possibly get, without actually being in Asia, and one which was situated in a place much more advantageous for mercantile trade and the accumulation of wealth, as opposed to Rome, which was first constructed on the Palatine Hill by Romulus, who had the intention of enforcing secure borders and martial prowess. This "new" city of Constantine, which was actually a much older Greek settlement formerly known as Byzantium, would receive the updated title of Constantinople. This location became the capital of the empire, while Rome was after this time, overall left increasingly to desolation. Constantine did initially have some good buildings constructed at Constantinople, these were a nymphaeum and the philadelphion, but these both were built using stolen material from older monuments in Rome. The last of the magnificent structures of Rome were constructed by Constantine's rival, Maxentius, who had been one of, if not the most benefic and flourishing rulers of Rome since the days of Pax Romana. This is the man whom Constantine defeated, and attempted to erase entirely from history. The Basilica of Maxentius, a structure of unrivaled beauty in its time, had its construction interrupted by Constantine's attack, though he surprisingly had its construction completed later, but then unsurprisingly had it renamed to the Basilica of Constantine, and had placed in it a colossal statue of none other than himself. The head and some other fractions of this statue are still in Rome, now at the Vatican, no doubt where Constantine would have wanted them. The Basilica of Maxentius itself still partially stands as well, looming in austere power over the surrounding city. Close by the basilica still stands another of the many beautiful structures built by Maxentius. This building is known as the Temple of Romulus. During his life, Maxentius took the opposite action of Constantine, and instead of murdering his own son, he had his son deified after his tragic death due to sickness, and had a fine temple constructed in honour of the boy, whose name was Romulus. The structure still survives to this day thanks to it being temporarily made into a church, ironically meaning that the Christians who worshipped there unknowingly had preserved for us the legacy of the Pagans. Other than the Basilica of Maxentius, which Constantine merely completed, and did not conceive of, Constantine only constructed two other noteworthy structures within Rome.

These are the Baths of Constantine, and The Basilica of Saint Peter, which was made to appease Constantine's new found allies among Rome's middle eastern migrant community. Little traces remain of the Baths of Constantine, and there is not much to say other than that they were the last baths to be constructed within Rome. They were built within the cities traditional ancient borders, but are of an irregular and rather narrow design, unlike all of the more vast bathing complexes of the earlier Pagan emperors. This seems to be due to a construction within a cramped and narrow space, which already had several houses standing on the site, which had to be demolished to make room for the Baths of Constantine to exist at all. The basilica however, is more interesting. This structure was built, as expected, close to Transtiberium, the immigrant slum on the outskirts of Rome, and the neighbourhood where christianity had the strongest hold over the population. The site itself was not an empty plot of land, but an area with structures already standing on it's grounds. Upon the Vatican hill was an old necropolis (where Peter's body was supposedly buried). Adjacent to this cemetery was a small temple or shrine to the Anatolian earth goddess, Cybele. There also was an old racecourse, called the Circus of Caligula, though this had seemingly fallen into disuse by this time. All of these older structures were removed gradually, or immediately buried beneath the new christian church. The basilica itself was not anything very special in terms of architecture. However, as far as early christian churches go, it was remarkable in comparison to them, though that is not saying much.

The form of all basilicas, and subsequently most churches today, is itself something that is not a christian creation, but it is in fact scavenged from the general design of older Roman basilicas, which were not typically places of worship, but of business, mercantile discussion, and casual leisure to the Pagan Romans. The basilical form, associated heavily with finance and monetary gain, was what early christian leaders selected as the house of their new god. The old Pagan temples were not meant to house crowds of peasants, and so they only had room for the statue of the deity and offerings. The beautiful columns of these temples also clearly bear a resemblance to the truly ancient old growth forests in which our ancestors worshipped the gods before the times when these wonderful temples were built.

Constantine's basilica of Saint Peter stood for several centuries, rotting ever steadily, despite christianity remaining in power. However, by the renaissance, with the rediscovery of Greco-Roman literature, and Europe generally beginning to successfully assert itself against the tides of islamic and mongol expansion, the old basilica constructed by Constantine was finally put out of it's misery and demolished, and beneath it's ruins were recovered fragmentary inscriptions from the altar of the old Temple of Cybele which had stood before Constantine's structure. The fine structure you see there today, is what the renaissance architects had built in place of the old Constantinian structure. The renaissance Basilica of Saint Peter was built taking heavy inspiration from the old Roman Pagan structures, namely the temple known as the Pantheon, and the many Imperial Baths, and not from Constantine's structure. Today it seems unbelievably beautiful to us, but we must realize that powerful structures and shockingly magnificent interiors like this existed commonly throughout the Greco-Roman world, before the rise of christianity, that is.

So it is that the buildings created by Maxentius still stand, and the ones built by Constantine have been consigned to oblivion. But oh yes, how could I forget, I suppose that the triumphal arch of Constantine does still stand. This arch he had built just after his victory over Maxentius, and before he murdered his family, those killings taking place over a decade after the battle at the Milvian Bridge. The arch contains no references or imagery that involve christianity at all, and it's construction heavily utilizes cannibalized components from earlier pieces of art commissioned by older emperors from the times of Pax Romana. For that reason I consider it to be hardly a structure of his own invention. Despite all of this, I contend that it is quite possible that Constantine, were he alive today, could still find some comfort

knowing that his beloved Vatican still enacts it's precious christian virtues of loving and tolerating foreigners, and also of not worrying about hygiene. I know this, because I have been there, and walked through the city of Rome, and that of the Vatican myself.

Near the Colosseum, the Pantheon, the other structures of the superior Pagan emperors, and all of the pleasant streets that I walked in Rome, you will not find filth cluttering every gutter, nor will you find any gangs of military age africans and semites roaming about. On the streets of Rome there are indeed some Italian soldiers brandishing weapons and guarding their monuments, but those of us who obey the law, and are not despicable cowards who fear the image of a rifle, have nothing to fear from the sight of friendly men at arms. Those Pagan places are quite clean, and the imperial structures magnificent and awe-inspiring, despite the damage done by christians over the centuries.

But on Constantine's Vatican hill? Well, the streets are strewn with trash, and the sidewalks are crowded with packs of immigrants, from Africa as well as the Levant. These were the people who's faith Constantine adopted, so as I said I am sure he would not mind that his legacy has all been levelled, so long as the descendants of his preferred companions still roam about on the site where his church once stood.

People often point out that Constantine was lenient towards other religions, and did not violently harm Pagans during his rule. This is true enough, though I suspect that this is merely because the vast majority of the population, at least in Europe, was still firmly Pagan, and hadn't yet been infected to a point of severe illness. Christianity needed to become more centralized, and more cohesive, before it could truly go about accomplishing it's ends. Constantine was instrumental in this centralization process. Everyone knows about the edict of Milan in 313, though this was merely an edict of toleration, and not a statement of conversion. This edict, like many things attributed solely to Constantine, was not his own creation, but was done in collaboration with Licinius, who was a Pagan, and this wasn't even the first edict of toleration either, as similar edicts had already been issued by Galerius and Maxentius before this. It was as early as 314, just two years after the Milvian Bridge, that Constantine was already interacting directly with christian bishops, as in that year he called a council of them at Arelate in Gaul. At this council, very conveniently for Constantine, the christian bishops, for some unfathomable reason, suddenly enacted many new rules which were not seen before among christians, and which just so happened to benefit Constantine's new vision of his own empire. Easter was now set on a universal date for all churches, instead of the older christian way where individual churches would set the date as they deemed correct. Christians who refused to serve in Constantine's imperial army were now to be, at least on paper, excommunicated, despite the gospels and earlier christian writers clearly promoting staunch pacifism.

Despite this early date of the synod of Arelate, Constantine at this point does not seem to have yet been a christian, or at least not a very committed one, because as I've said the material evidence at this time still shows his use of explicitly Pagan imagery, with a complete absence of christian imagery. He was still comfortably minting coins where his image appears alongside the images of Pagan gods.

It is by the year 325 at the latest where his heart seems to have been most likely set on the new belief, as this was when he called the famous council of Nicaea. This council brought the eastern demagogues who lead the orthodox faction to the forefront of the church's new government sanctioned hierarchy, and attempted to push aside all the other various factions who leaned too far on the spectrum of christianity away from the central point, this midpoint being conveniently the philosophical home of the orthodox faction. I find it hard to believe, that it is supposedly just a simple coincidence, that all of the beliefs of the orthodox faction, just so happen to blend together into an incoherent and appalling mess, all

the beliefs of the other various christian factions, which had composed christianity from the start, as if to syncretize them all into one universal christianity that could conveniently win over as many people from all the various sects as possible. One faction says Jesus is purely man, one faction says he is purely god, and many factions are at various places in between. What does the orthodox faction do to solve this dilemma, and the many others produced by believing in an absurd fiction as something infallible? It produces an abominable, insultingly stupid synthesis, that is a complete rejection of the foundational rule of all Greek logic.

If we are using the Aristotelian logical system, and not being incomprehensible fools, then the inputs of 'man' and 'god' negate each other. A man cannot create any cosmos, and a living man is always subject to mortality and the provable laws of physics. This means automatically that no man can be god.

"But he has two natures!"

Then he is two different people, and one of them died while the other continued to live. No one has two natures, and no human can be something that is not human. Likewise with faith and works. These objectively are two different things, and logic demands that if man is saved, it is by one or the other. You cannot have both, and you cannot equalize two things which are not the same. If man is really justified by faith alone, as much of the orthodox faction teaches, then works are not required. But, as they say, faith without works, is supposedly "dead". Though if that is really the case, then justification is not, in fact, by faith alone. It is ultimately in that case, by works, since it is works that are required for justification in that line of reasoning. The only christian counter against me here, is to flee into absurd circular reasoning, which is incomprehensible and philosophically untenable. And do not make me write at length about that unequivocally insane, catastrophically nonsensical monstrosity which christians refer to as the 'trinity'. Even the scriptures themselves only loosely support this absurd idea, and christians admit that the whole concept can only be defended by appeals to faith.

You may either have nobility, and accept reality as it truly is, or you can be a leftist, and deny reality in favour of an absurd fantasy that just so happens to suit you perfectly. "But it doesn't benefit me, I have to struggle with sin!" It does benefit you, at least in your eyes, as long as any part of the equation involves you receiving eternal paradise.

These bishops, Constantine's companions, these africans and semites, desire to force us to throw away all dignity, and to throw away all intellect, and become vulgar idiots like their victims, or malicious deceivers like them, by contending that their beloved Jesus was in fact fully both man and god at the same time, and that faith and works are the same thing even though they are not, despite the fact that they really are, but actually are not. This is, in truth, the diseased egalitarian impulse to level and erase differentiation, and to equalize things which are objectively not equal. This mandatory cognitive dissonance, this universally imposed idiocy, could only have the effect of dumbing down and thoroughly weakening the population which it was forcefully foisted upon. What we shall soon see as I delve further through late antiquity and into the dark ages, is that this is unquestionably what happened to Europe.

I don't state that the orthodox faction itself was created at Nicaea, it is quite clear that they already had existed for some time. Though it is certain that here at Nicaea, their views were thoroughly organized and structured as they had not yet been before, under the watchful eye and strict authority of Constantine of course. It was a few years before this council, in 321, when Constantine passed a new law which allowed jews to serve on municipal councils. In 322, Constantine ceased minting coins with the images of Pagan deities upon them. In 325, along with initiating the council of Nicaea, Constantine also

had the ancient gladiatorial games banned, probably at the behest of the church who, imitating the behaviour of Christ, has always been eager to show contempt for martial prowess and masculine athleticism. For some reason, Constantine did not in fact show such scruples only a short time before this, when he had Frankish princes torn limb from limb by wild beasts in the arena at Augusta Treverorum during his campaigns. Only one year after Nicaea, in 326, he went through with the ultimate sin against his ancestors, and against his old Greco-Roman religion, when this literal cuckold, in his impotent resentment, had his son and wife murdered, his wife being burned to death by being thrown into a boiling bath. Of course, this was no big deal to the christian church, who to this day state that their god is perfectly willing to forgive Constantine for this crime, so long as Constantine tells his new imaginary friend that he is sorry, and most importantly, that he keeps believing in his new imaginary friend at any cost.

There exists an anecdote about this from the Greek Pagan author of the late fifth and early sixth century called Zosimus, who used as his source for this time an earlier Pagan author called Eunapius, who was from Sardis, in Lydia. The story states that when Pagan priests refused to purify Constantine after he had murdered his own family, Constantine turned to an Egyptian, who promised him that Jesus would forgive him. I do not doubt that this story contains some truth, though I believe that Constantine was not as impulsive as he is often portrayed, and that the murder of his family, along with the abandonment and destruction of Rome and its old religion, were actions that he had carefully thought out, and were not decisions that he made on an immediate whim as this story portrays.

I think it more likely that it was only after he had found out about his son and his wife, and not yet murdered them, that he began to seek out a new religion in advance, one which could simultaneously forgive him for the crime he planned to commit, but also alter and change the Roman empire itself, to suit his vision of it. Maybe he talked to priests of his former favourite god Sol Invictus or other various deities, asking if anyone could still be purified if they committed brutal familicide, and when these Pagan priests said no, he turned to the cults of the east, and found, possibly through an african priest residing in Rome's slums (there were many of those), that he could be forgiven, if he would go over to the corpse of the Jew. It is only natural that Constantine would gravitate towards an eastern cult which inculcates passive meekness and obedience amongst the population, while simultaneously absolving him of any guilt for his monstrous acts.

Constantine also began after the council of Nicaea to engage in behaviours that would be imitated by the vast majority of the emperors who succeeded him. This was the deliberate destruction of Rome's priceless architectural heritage and culture, with the temples and other grand structures from both the old Republic and the Empire being demolished, the scrapped material obtained from them either being sold for profit, or used to construct vastly inferior utilitarian churches and residential buildings. The latter part of Constantine's reign also saw him first institute the trend of financially and bureaucratically favouring christians, while legally restricting the power of Pagans, something that also continued among the majority of his successors. Funds which once went to the temples now went to the church.

Christianity had remained deeply unpopular until this time. Only as much as one in twenty people of the empire, that is, less than one percent, were christians before the time of Constantine. Christianity did not gain popularity because it was convincing. It is not a coincidence that only after one hundred and fifty years of almost constant government funded bribery, torture, imprisonment, and massacre of any rivals, that the number of christians by the mid 450s had just so happened to rise from less than one percent to over ninety percent, whereas during all of the three hundred years before christianity had received any government enforcement, it remained as the vile and obscure cult of the lowliest urbanite underclasses.

The government was restructured as well. Instead of the ancient Pagan senate, now it was christian bishops, palace concubines, and court eunuchs who consulted and influenced the emperor. Aesthetically, instead of the austere Pagan style of old, the pompous and debasing fashion of oriental despotism was enforced.

It was within the reign of the emperors who succeeded Constantine, where christians would gradually consolidate even further, gaining more and more power, and with their newfound power would eventually complete their goal of using overt force to close the minds of Europeans away from their ancestral heritage. The church historian Eusebius, who I have mentioned previously, already wrote of his desire to have this enacted. It isn't something that corrupt and degenerate emperors alone wanted. It is in fact something that christianity wanted, because christianity is inherently corrupt and degenerated.

Constantine already had three sons with Fausta, who were the half-brothers of Crispus who was now dead. These three sons were Constantius II, Constans, and Constantine II. The brother who rose to the most prominence out of this trio was Constantius II. Both Constantius II and Constans followed in their fathers footsteps by slaughtering their relations. Immediately after Constantine's death, Constantius II had his father buried in a pompous ceremony at the new city of Constantinople. Shortly after this, Constantius II initiated a massacre of his family, killing two of his uncles, and six of his cousins. So the rule of the new empire was secured for Constantius II and his two brothers. A few years after this massacre, Constans killed his brother, Constantine II. So at this point, the empire was ruled by Constantius II, and Constans jointly. These weak men both were under the strong influence of the christian eunuchs, courtiers, concubines, and bishops that accompanied them, and together these two continued in their fathers religious footsteps, and would push the anti-Pagan policies of Constantine even further. Starting as early as the 340s and 350s, taking part in Pagan rituals and sacrifices was already banned, under pain of the death penalty. The Altar of Victory, which had stood within the Curia since the days of Augustus, was removed. So, if you are so obnoxiously retarded, that you still want to believe the conversion to christianity for the majority of Europeans was autonomous in any way, then you should simply leave this work, and go continue rotting in your mental illness. Nominally "converting" to a government enforced cult, and dragging yourself to church once a week to listen to the local african immigrant preaching useless platitudes at you, is not in any way a free choice. "Oh, but if they really wanted to choose the way of their ancestors they would've let themselves be killed like us brave christians did!"

Many actually did do this, in the countless civil wars I will soon relate. But as for the majority of citizens, who were not soldiers, the act of deciding reluctantly to preserve your life, and thus the lives of your descendants, by not being a naïve idiot and throwing your life away, is not a free act. It is coercion, it is nothing more than force. In this equation, if there is no force, then there would be no conversion. If someone is subject to outside force, then their actions are not free in any way. If a human population can be forced into islam, or forced into communism, or forced into liberalism, than they can be forced into christianity as well. Before laws like these were enforced, Europe simply remained Pagan for 300 years while the repulsive filth of christianity grew but little, and remained inert among the underclasses beneath the surface. If these laws were never instituted, Europe would still be Pagan today.

For the most part, the only people who willingly converted to eastern idiocy, were the amorphous mobs of Africa and the Levant, the urbanite underclasses of the imperial cities, and Constantine, the familicidal cuckold who abandoned Rome.

Despite all this, Constantius II did in fact leave the Pagan priestly colleges intact, though it would not be too much longer before the rest of the christian emperors would order them to be disbanded. The legal restrictions imposed by Constantius II and his brother were unsurprisingly not all that popular in the west, as the majority of the Pagan population at this point simply started practicing their rites in secret, or in many areas still freely in the open, as the officials there who were still Pagans themselves did not bother to enforce the new laws, and even the christian officials could not possibly enforce the new laws, as most of the populace itself was still pagan. Constans ruled the western half of the empire, while his brother ruled the more christian eastern half. In the west, Constans had become very unpopular because of the new religious restrictions, and because of his alleged homosexuality.

There arose in the west against Constans a general of British and Germanic descent, called Magnentius. Magnentius was a popular commander, and was part of the elite palatine imperial guard units known as the Jovians and Herculians, which had been established back in the pagan times of Diocletian's tetrarchy. In 350, he killed Constans, and secured power in the west for himself. He began to undo some of the christian restrictions against Pagans, and one christian writer of the time states that Magnentius himself was a Pagan. I cannot say for sure what belief Magnentius held, as it is true that on his coinage he used christian symbols. He may have only eased up the restrictions on Pagans in order to gain their favour, as they were still the vast majority of the population in the western provinces where he had taken power. Whatever his own belief was, it remains true that the majority of the soldiers under his command were Pagans. Initially, Magnentius actually seemed to pursue peace and diplomacy with the east, though the desire for peace was evidently not felt by the more Christian half of the empire.

Constantius II organized his army, and launched a very large campaign against Magnentius, thus beginning one of many more Roman civil wars of the fourth century and beyond, in which the more Pagan Latin, Celtic, and Germanic western half of the empire fought against the more christian east. The east had more wealth, and a higher population, and many very populous rural areas and urban centres in Africa, the Levant, and elsewhere to draw monstrous amounts of manpower from.

The army of Magnentius was primarily Gallo-Roman, though also among them were many Franks and Saxons. These soldiers fought with great ferocity, but they were ultimately defeated at Mursa in Pannonia by Constantius II, who won a pyrrhic victory. This battle, though mostly forgotten today, was one of the largest and most catastrophic battles ever fought between Romans. Magnentius did survive the battle, and retreated back across Italy and into southern Gaul. In 353, his remaining forces fought for the last time, this time at Mons Seleucus in Gaul, where they were defeated by Constantius II. Magnentius then decided to take death before surrender or enslavement, and he took his own life. The victorious Constantius II proceeded to immediately reinstate his restrictions against Pagans, and then embarked on seemingly vengeful campaigns against the Germans and Sarmatians. Despite losing a great number of men fighting against Magnentius, Constantius II was able to keep the borders of the empire secure with the military forces he still had available to him.

It is at this point in the narrative where I shall introduce two figures, who are true opposites, and contrast each other very powerfully. Born of opposite heritage, in opposite locations, and enacting opposite courses of life. They lived during the same era, yet both would've been more at home in other times quite remote from their own. These two men are Athanasius, and Julian. The behaviour of Athanasius belongs to modernity, and the behaviour of Julian to the glory of antiquity.

To discuss Athanasius, we must first examine the material conditions from which he spawned. Like so many of his leading christian allies, he was an african, and like his predecessor Origen, he was from Alexandria, or possibly one of the outlying Nile delta villages among the sultry swamplands

adjacent to the city. This city was of extreme importance to the entire christian movement, and to other similar religious movements in late antiquity. The city itself was founded by Alexander in Hellenistic times, though by this period of the late empire it now bore little resemblance to what Alexander created. It was essentially the mercantile and cosmopolitan capitol of the entire empire. An excessive amount of wealth existed there, though this was mostly held by the nobility, which were often of Ptolemaic Greek and Latin origin. The vast majority of the population was in all probability made up of the local dark skinned african and various semitic peoples, including many jews. Yes, I said dark skinned africans, because archaeological and literary evidence of antiquity proves to us that the majority of the common people in Egypt were dark skinned. I state this in opposition to the stance that both many hermeticist Pagans, in addition to many right wing christians often take, which is to contend that the peoples of Egypt were simply always white Indo-Europeans right up until the time of the arab conquests.

I will now relate some of the lines of Herodotus, from Book 2 of *The Histories*, which will reveal the character of both Egypt, and the Egyptians within Greco-Roman times.

Not only is the Egyptian climate peculiar to that country, and the Nile different in its behaviour from other rivers elsewhere, but the Egyptians themselves in their manners and customs seem to have reversed the ordinary practices of mankind. For instance, women attend market and are employed in trade, while men stay at home and do the weaving. In weaving the normal way is to work the threads of the weft upwards, but the Egyptians work them downwards.

They practice circumcision, while men of other nations – except for those who have learnt from Egypt – leave their private parts as nature made them.

In writing or calculating, instead of going, like the Greeks, from left to right, the Egyptians go from right to left – and obstinately maintain that theirs is the dextrous method, ours being left-handed and awkward. They have two sorts of writing, the sacred and the common. They are religious to excess, beyond any other nation in the world, and here are some of the customs which illustrate the fact; they drink from brazen cups which they scour every day – everyone, without exception. They wear linen clothes which they make a special point of continually washing. They circumcise themselves for cleanliness' sake, preferring to be clean rather than to be comely. The priests shave their bodies all every other day to guard against the presence of lice, or anything else equally unpleasant, while they are about their religious duties; the priests, too, wear linen only, and shoes made from the papyrus plant – these materials, for dress and shoes, being the only ones allowed them.

Their life, however, is not by any means all hardship, for they enjoy advantages too: for instance, they are free from all personal expense, having bread made for them out of the sacred grain, and a plentiful daily supply of goose-meat and beef, with wine in addition.

My own idea on the subject was based first on the fact that they have dark skins and woolly hair (not that that amounts to much, as other nations have the same), and secondly, and more especially on the fact that Colchians, the Egyptians, and the Ethiopians are the only races which from ancient times have practiced circumcision. The Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine themselves admit that they adopted the practice from Egypt, and the Syrians who live near the rivers Thermodon and Parthenius, as well as their neighbours the Macronians, say that they learnt it only a short time ago from the Colchians. No other nations use circumcision, and all these are without doubt following the Egyptian lead.

Here I have merely shown a handful of passages which relate to the peculiarities of the Egyptians in comparison to the Europeans, though Herodotus also writes at great length about the daily lives of the common Egyptians, in the marshlands and elsewhere, as well as the history of that land up until his time. From these writings we obtain a good idea of the exact heritage of Athanasius. Interestingly we can also see that the enforced law of genital mutilation practiced by the Hebrews was merely adopted from the Egyptians, and not commanded by “god”. Even the biblical narrative seems to imply this, as we only see this law being introduced in the timeline of scripture after the Hebrews had been enslaved for an extended period of time in Egypt. During the times of antiquity when Herodotus was writing, the term ‘Phoenician’ was used for anyone living within the general area of the Levantine coast, including the Judeans and Israelites, as well as the peoples descended from them like the Carthaginians.

On a digressional note regarding Egypt, I must explain how it was here that the hideous phenomenon of monkery was heavily fostered, and consequently made widespread in Europe. Now, it is true that Jesus himself was a essentially a monk, as his communistic moral maxims, approval of bodily mutilation, scorning of human reproduction, and disdain of martial prowess all confirm. Jesus was not however the very first to act this way. Writers of the time confirm that in Egypt, near the Red Sea, and elsewhere there were sects which engaged in a monastic way of life before the ministry of Christ had begun. At the Dead Sea in the Levant, there resided one of these cults, known as the essenes. Their dualistic and gnostic-esque beliefs were highly resentful towards the Greeks and Romans, calling them “sons of darkness”, and I speculate that it may have possibly been the essenes themselves who first fabricated the christian scriptures. We know for a fact that these men knew how to write Greek, as scrolls written in that language have been discovered amongst their writings in the Dead Sea scrolls. They also were very familiar with the old testament, and practiced baptism along with other proto-christian activities. We know that the essenes participated unsuccessfully in the jewish war on the jewish side, and we know that they were utterly and completely let down by their own doctrines, as they expected the war would be won due to the intervention of their divine jewish messiah, who they believed would defeat the “sons of darkness” forever. At the precise moment in history when the essenes seem to disappear, the christians and their writings begin to appear. I think some survivors among the essenes may have concocted christianity as a subversive form of vengeance against the gentiles after the obliteration of Jerusalem and it’s temple at the hands of emperor Titus in the year 70. In the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, there is in fact an entire chapter in which he contends that the essenes themselves were christians.

Evidence outside of the spurious gospel accounts for the existence of Jesus is non-existent, and this fact heavily gives credit to the theory that christianity was concocted deliberately. Philo, who wrote extensively on Palestine during the exact period when Jesus supposedly lived, makes no mention at all of him, but does mention several jews who pretended to be messiahs. The other primary sources that we have which are not the scriptures are a few Roman writers, writing a century after the supposed birth of Christ, and these sources simply say that christians existed. Whether the creation of christianity was enacted by the essenes or not, the whole thing is highly suspicious, and I don’t think it is a coincidence that a jewish cult which seriously harmed Europe only started to appear immediately after Europeans had committed the ultimate insult against the jews, not only utterly dominating them in battle but also destroying their most holy city. Intentional, or unintentional, the disastrous result of christian doctrine remains the same.

Jerusalem was actually rebuilt by the Romans as a pagan city called Aelia Capitolina for a very long time. Jews were forbidden entry, a temple of Jupiter was built over the site of the destroyed jewish building, and the new name of the city itself came from the family name of emperor Hadrian, who

conducted a very thorough genocide against the jews. The city remained in this state until hordes of christians in late antiquity – monks, priests, and peasants, made it once again into Jerusalem, and jews were freely able to live there once more.

The phenomenon of monkery spawned directly from christianity, no matter if modern protestants claim that monkery is not biblical. When I was at the end of my christian days I too tried to tell myself that the scriptures did not enforce monkery, but the truth is that they simply do. The monks were the ones who followed the commands of christ most devotedly, and the command of christ is to destroy your own life. “Saint” Anthony is one of the most famous of all monks, who in the 200s ‘heroically’ devoted himself to a life of sleeping in decrepit tombs in the desert while battling hallucinations brought on by intense starvation. Many other deluded and unfortunate men were drawn into this hideous mockery of a lifestyle by Anthony. One of them was “saint” Hilarion, who at the age of just fifteen went to visit Anthony. He sought to emulate him, and set out for the holy land, where he built for himself a tiny cell that was just four feet wide and five feet high, so small that he could not even sit comfortably, nor could he lie down. Following the way of Christ he did not bother to ever wash the sack which clothed him, saying such a concern was unnecessary. Another of these Egyptian mystics, the so called “saint” Arsenius, cried so much during his incessant prayers that he went blind. Yet another disciple of Anthony, “saint” Pachomius, never laid down once while he slept for forty years, and he also tells us that many monks he knew had killed themselves by jumping from cliffs, cutting open their stomachs, and through several other ways. There are many more of these Egyptians, and I could keep this paragraph going for much longer, but I will now end it by returning to the topic of Athanasius. Did Athanasius do anything to stop this? Was he at all concerned about this unprecedented and utterly hideous plague of mental illness that was bringing so many men to such an abominable and pitiful state? This Athanasius, father of catholics, protestants, and byzantines, never condemned this, but condoned and praised it. Athanasius even wrote an entire book about Anthony, in which he praises and promotes his lifestyle, undoubtedly contributing to the spread of this mental disease into Europe.

Athanasius was of obscure origin, and did not know Latin, only writing in his native African Coptic language, as well as Greek. He was already a grown man and active in the church by the time of the council of Nicaea, though, very curiously, he only became a fanatical and prolific writer in defence of the orthodox faction after the council of Nicaea had taken place, when the power of his faction had been firmly entrenched. While the civil war was going on with Magnentius, Athanasius backed up Constantius II, even though Constantius II belonged to the semi-arian faction, which was heretical to the orthodox faction. The semi-arians sought a compromise between the arians and the orthodox faction, evidently Constantius II seemed to desire unifying the new religion to an even further degree than his father had before him.

Regarding Athanasius, his ceaseless and constant spewing forth of obstinately loyal literature in favour of his upstart cabal makes him seemingly into a fourth century Jean-Paul Marat, or Leon Trotsky. Called ‘the black dwarf’ in his time, due to his incredibly short stature and extremely dark complexion, he would’ve made for an unbelievable contrast physically were he somehow displayed next to the warriors and philosophers of old which had led the Indo-European world in better times, those times before Constantine, before the crisis of the third century, and before the church.

There exists a physical description of Athanasius, penned by the historical author Robert Payne, who seems to think that he is portraying the man positively, though since I am not brainwashed by specious platitudes, I can see clearly that this passage does in fact describe something more worthy of genuine ridicule and disgust, rather than sanctimonious praise.

In the history of the early Church no one was ever so implacable, so urgent in his demands upon himself or so derisive of his enemies. There was something in him of the temper of the modern dogmatic revolutionary: nothing stopped him. The Emperor Julian called him “hardly a man, only a little manikin.” Gregory Nazianzen said he was “angelic in appearance, and still more angelic in mind.” In a sense both were speaking the truth. The small dauntless man who saved the Church from a profound heresy, staying the disease almost single handed, was as astonishing in his appearance as he was in his courage. He was so small that his enemies called him a dwarf. He had a hook nose, a small mouth, short reddish beard which turned up at the ends in the Egyptian fashion, and his skin was blackish. His eyes were very small and he walked with a slight stoop, though gracefully as befitted a prince of the Church. He was less than thirty when he was made Bishop of Alexandria.

This is not the description of a hero, this is the description of a deformed monstrosity. This is the man who all of the orthodox faction claims loyalty to. According to Payne, here is what Athanasius had to say about the “heretical” sect of arianism, adopted by the Vandals and Goths, who right wing christians all praise so much, though they imitate them but little.

As for the Arians, Athanasius hated them with too great a fury to give them their proper names. He called them dogs, lions, hares, chameleons, hydras, eels, cuttlefish, gnats and beetles, and he was always resourceful in making them appear ridiculous...

He may have wrote a great amount, but he was clearly not the most creative or bright, as evidently his only tactic for insults was to break out some kind of ancient zoological encyclopedia and just start picking the names of various creatures at random. Only someone who is so utterly resentful and hateful towards nature itself would surmise that it is a good insult to compare someone to a “Lion”, for I, Achilles, and Alexander, the very same who founded the city from which Athanasius parasitically leeches off of throughout his life, would consider being seen in the likeness of an animal so powerful and ferocious as a Lion to be something complimentary and honourable. Alexander dressed himself in armour that resembled a lion, and in Book 22 of *The Iliad*, a work one thousand times superior to anything formed in the fevered mind of a jew, the demigod Achilles confidently compares himself to a lion in this instance:

Hector, you must be mad to talk to me about a pact. Lions do not come to terms with men, nor does the wolf see eye to eye with the lamb – they are enemies to the end. It is the same with you and me. Friendship between us is impossible, and there will be no truce of any kind till one of us has fallen and glutted the stubborn god of battles with his blood.

Homer also compares the hero Odysseus with a lion in Book 22 of *The Odyssey*, and Homer never exhibits the petty judaic superiority complex over animals in any of his works.

She found Odysseus among the corpses of the fallen, spattered with blood and filth, like a lion when he comes from feeding on some farmer’s bullock, with the blood dripping from his breast and jaws on either side, a fearsome spectacle. That was how Odysseus looked, with the gore thick on his legs and arms.

As for cuttlefish, gnats and beetles, well, there is truthfully more to be learned by studying those creatures than there is to be learned by reading any paradoxical tripe written by Athanasius.

And so, you right wing christians, this Athanasius is your “hero”, he is indeed the one who you receive your philosophy from. Because of either your ignorance, or your cowardice, or perhaps some mixture of those two, you obstinately cling to a deformed black skinned revolutionary, a demagogical

cuckold traitor, and an innumerable bastardized mob of those who sided with these two, and abandoned their superior paternal ways, inherited from time immemorial. There is something also to be said about the physical conditions which brought forth your philosophy. Indeed it may have initially been spawned in the Levant, but despite this it was unquestionably formed and nourished to maturity in Africa more than anywhere else, and especially within the stifflingly heavy cosmopolitan air of Alexandria, and the low lying marshlands at the mouth of the Nile. The most consistent early manuscripts of the new testament that we have are the Alexandrian ones, and this marsh is where so many of the most important church fathers originated. Compare this kind of environment to the untarnished steppes of Scythia, the clean and pure climate of Attica and the Peloponnese, or the verdant, harmonious valleys and hill country of Latium. You seem to emulate the founding populations of the early church in the fact that you, like those warped and castrated bishops of late antiquity, reside within an immense swamp. In this case, it is the southeastern states of the USA, where the majority of you just so happen to dwell, though I must also mention that your home is in all likelihood even more humid and polluted than that which produced the machinations of the orthodox faction.

Now is the appropriate time to introduce the emperor Julian into the narrative. He was one of the relatives of Constantine who was not murdered by Constantius II, though this is probably because Julian was just a small child at the time of the purges. He was left an orphan by the massacre that Constantius II initiated, and he spent his entire youth under the close supervision of Constantius II, being educated in the same way that Constantius II had been. For the imperial family, gone was the old style of education which had sustained the Greco-Roman nobility at least since the archaic age. There was no longer any joyfully devoted study of Greek and Latin literature within austere colonnaded porticos, this ancient manner of education which had formed the minds of the imperial aristocracy into something truly formidable, making them well versed in history, philosophy, poetry, logic, rhetoric, and geometry by a very young age. The new way which Constantine instituted for his descendants, was for the young ones to be taught the rambling scriptures of the Hebrews, along with other christian texts, within the tenebrous recesses of the newly built palace at Constantinople, though in the particular case of Julian, he received the same education after being relocated away from the new imperial palace.

Julian was taken away from Constantinople after the slaughter of his father and other relatives, and spent the next portion of his life being closely guarded and forbidden from public life at varying locations within Asia Minor, for the initial part at Bithynia, and then at Cappadocia. He continued to receive his christian education, under the tutelage of several bishops and eunuchs which were employed specifically to teach him. Two men seem to have been responsible for introducing him to Pagan literature. One of these was a Goth named Mardonius, who Julian in his own writings claims was the one who is responsible for his way of life, that is, a Pagan one. This man Mardonius appears to be the primary Pagan influence on Julian, as it was he who introduced Julian to the writings of Homer, Plato, Aristotle, and Theophrastus. This was done in direct opposition, and seemingly in secret, against an imperial decree issued by Constantius II which specifically forbid Julian to be educated in Greek philosophy. Mardonius himself seems to have been a crypto-pagan, and had a very austere ideology which was disdainful of the corruption and decadence which had accelerated intensely within the empire at this time. It is true that Mardonius was a eunuch, though it is important to realize that this was not something he desired, as he was not a christian who mutilated himself in order to attain “heaven”, rather Mardonius was indeed a Goth who was forcefully made into a eunuch by the Romans, who had employed him as a slave and a teacher long before Julian was born.

The other one who provided Julian with a Pagan education seems to have been inadvertent in the act. This was George of Cappadocia, an arian bishop (Constantius II favoured the arians and semi-arians), who possessed a very vast library of literature, with several old Greek and Latin Pagan works interspersed between the multitude of christian texts. Though his task was to instruct Julian in christianity, it seems that he did lend some of his Pagan texts to Julian, who read them favourably, or perhaps Julian read these books without George's consent. Ironically, George was a fervent anti-Pagan, and behaved very obnoxiously against Pagans during his life, preventing them from celebrating their festivals or making sacrifices, and ransacking the Pagan Serapeum complex in Alexandria with the help of an armed christian mob. We will see the just fate that befell George shortly.

By the age of 18, Julian was allowed out of his exile, and around this time he also obtained the status of a lector within the church, and he undoubtedly had a detailed knowledge of the bible, which is very apparent in his surviving works. He began to travel around the Greek world, listening to Pagan philosophers and studying Pagan writings. By the age of 20, he became a Pagan, though for obvious reasons he at this time remained a crypto-Pagan. He attended the famous Platonic academy at Athens, which was still functioning, though by this time it had heavily become aligned to the philosophy of Neoplatonism, which was the system that Julian adhered to.

Neoplatonism represents the final incarnation of the ancestral traditions within Europe before the usurpation by christianity. Neoplatonism, like christianity, manichaeism and gnosticism, also sprang from intellectuals in the east and Africa, and its doctrines consequently had some similarities to the semitic cults, although it must be said that the philosopher who is regarded as the foremost authority of the Neoplatonists, Plotinus, wrote one of the most thorough and devoted writings against gnosticism that the world has yet seen.

Despite this, many practitioners of Neoplatonism advocated for periods of celibacy before engaging in theurgy, and abstinence from eating meat, and some Neoplatonists even contended that animal sacrifice should not be practiced. A very heavy emphasis was placed by them on metaphysics, divination, and theurgy.

After the death of Magnentius, Constantius II appointed Julian, now the only eligible living male in his family, to be his new representative in Gaul. Though Julian had no experience as a soldier and seemingly was mostly interested in philosophy, he proved himself to be a capable and effective general, leading his army in his first campaign against the Franks, and recapturing the town of Colonia Agrippina (today known as Cologne). After this, he won a victory at Argentoratum against the Alamanni, and though his forces (among which were the elite Jovians and Herculians) were outnumbered, during a tough battle they managed to rout their enemies back across the Rhine, while receiving little casualties themselves. This was the last great victory that the Romans ever won in the west. After this battle, the borders of the west were finally secure, and Roman life in Gaul was revitalized, with the heavy taxes enforced within the area by the christian emperors now being removed on the orders of Julian.

Julian wrote an account of his years in Gaul himself, but it has most likely not survived into the present day. Despite this, we do have an account of these years written by Ammianus Marcellinus, a Pagan, and one of the legionaries that fought in the army of Julian during those times.

Back in the east, Constantius II was having less success against the Persians than he had found against his own countrymen previously, so he ordered some of Julian's best units to be transferred over to the east, to help in his campaigns. Julian's men (who were almost all Pagans) were not exactly enthusiastic about leaving their families to go fight for an emperor who wanted to outlaw their way of life, so they revolted, and at Lutetia Parisorum proclaimed Julian as the new emperor, raising him up on a shield in the

old Pagan Germanic tradition, as most of the soldiers in Julian's army were of Gallo-Roman or Germanic descent themselves. Julian accepted this, and initially, like Magnentius before him, tried to pursue diplomacy with Constantius II.

Once again, Constantius II did not accept this. Julian then marched his men to the east, and Constantius II abandoned the Persian front by marching his armies towards the west.

But Constantius II would never face Julian in battle. He reportedly spotted a random headless corpse on the road while travelling, and interpreted this as a bad omen. He then became severely ill, and died of his illness while only in his forties. His armies did not pursue conflict with Julian, and instead of another civil war occurring, Julian was made the sole ruler of the empire.

After the funeral and burial of Constantius II, the first thing that Julian did was proclaim his Paganism openly. He then began the incredibly tremendous task of restoring the empire into a state more reminiscent of the old Pagan times. Julian was highly intelligent and devoted, and he was well aware that the imperial court and bureaucracy had become rotten to the core, and needed to be purged. He removed from power the countless minor officials, courtiers, extraneous palace staff, and packs of various court eunuchs which had sustained Constantine and his sons. Julian aspired to maintain the old senatorial system, the same which had governed the empire during the principate.

The senate at Rome, which was still devotedly Pagan, was once again regarded with respect, and Julian also attempted to reform the new Christian senate in Constantinople to the more honest style of the older ideal. Temples were reopened and protected, and surviving inscriptions within old Pagan sites from this time show that Julian was viewed with gratitude and love by the many Pagans still within the empire. The extremely harsh taxes which had plagued the empire were removed by Julian as well, just as they had been removed by him in Gaul earlier during his life. The legal privileges and financial backing which the church had received from Constantine and his sons was fully removed, and Julian cleverly pointed out to the seething bishops their own scriptures, which do state that Christians should be happy with no power, and suffer 'injustice' willingly. Julian executed bishops of the church and other Christian leaders who had acted in particularly disgraceful ways towards Pagans. Julian knew about the abominable interactions that went on between the bishops and many prostitutes, and so Julian put an end to this as well. The Christians, under the leadership of a rapacious thug called Paulus who was acting on the orders of Constantius II, had established death camps in the Levant, in which Pagans from across the empire were tortured and killed, for the "crime" of remaining firm in their ancestral honour. Ammianus Marcellinus records this in his work: *Paulus proceeded, as he was ordered, full of deadly eagerness and rage; inviting all kinds of calumnies, so that numbers from every part of the empire were brought before him, noble and low born alike; some of whom were condemned to imprisonment, others to instant death. The city which was chosen to witness these fatal scenes was Scythopolis in Palestine, which for two reasons seemed the most suitable of all places; first, because it was little frequented and secondly, because it was halfway between Antioch and Alexandria, from which city many of those brought before this tribunal came.*

Since the entire operation of this entire disgusting Jewish scheme had now been halted, the operation of these death camps naturally had also been halted by emperor Julian.

Upon the accession of Julian, at Alexandria, the remaining Pagans there found themselves with the backing of the state, and so they enacted just punishment upon George of Cappadocia, the same wretched bishop and fervent anti-Pagan who utterly failed in his task of brainwashing the young emperor Julian into Christianity. George also seems to have been something of a proto-capitalist, as it is known that he was buying up the papyrus marshes and salt lakes in his times. A band of the Pagan men of Alexandria cast George into prison, along with two of his accomplices who had assisted him in the overturning of a

Pagan shrine. One of these accomplices was very interestingly the master of the mint, which is equivalent to a person responsible for the printing of money in our own times. These three were held in prison for almost a month, when on christmas eve, the Pagan men assembled and took hold of these wretches by force. The Pagans then proceeded to shout with triumph, while they kicked and stomped George and the other two christians to death. The carcass of George was placed onto a camel with the other two being tied onto the camel with ropes so that they would drag behind it. The camel was then lead by the Pagans through every part of the city, a fitting and rightful insult towards the vile christian rabble which undoubtedly witnessed it. The bodies of George and his accomplices were burned, and the ashes were thrown into the Mediterranean.

Once more the ancestral ways were favoured by the state, to the dismay of the upstart semitic cult. Julian also very cleverly introduced a very specific new restriction on the christians. This was done to curb the influence of one of their many tactics of duplicitous intrigue which they had been instituting for a long time with their goal of deceiving as many unknowing people as possible. This practice of the christians was their infiltration of the education system, in which instead of teaching their own inferior jewish documents, they would instead teach a bastardized and warped interpretation of Greco-Roman classical texts which they despised, thus obtaining from this method not only the allure and pleasantness of the superior and more beautiful writings of the Pagans to keep the students engaged, but also consistent monetary gain, and the simultaneous preaching of their own christian gibberish to the students. Lots of these “teachers” (as well as most of the early bishops) were not even Europeans either. They were africans and Asiatics who conveniently decided to relocate into Europe, to teach people who did not want, nor ask for their newfangled doctrines. Something very similar has happened in more recent times, that is immigrants and leftists flooding into authority positions at the schools, where they teach older literature, (because all of their own literature like that of their early christian predecessors is vastly inferior) but lecture on and on about how “problematic” it is, and always being diligent to ensure that it is their own leftist doctrines that the students absorb, and not those of the source text. The edict banning this sinister practice predictably aroused the fury of the christian teachers, as they could no longer deceive people with impunity, and now had to teach their own precious gospels and epistles, rather than parasitically stealing the texts of writers who’s work they both taught and ascribed to demons simultaneously. Because I am in agreement with this edict of the emperor, and because the emperor is a far better writer than I, I now will relate here one portion of this edict, the text of which has survived in its entirety.

But while I applaud them for aspiring to such high pretensions, I should applaud them still more if they did not utter falsehoods and convict themselves of thinking one thing and teaching their pupils another. What! Was it not the gods who revealed all their learning to Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates and Lysias? Did not these men think that they were consecrated, some to Hermes, others to the Muses? I think it is absurd that men who expound the works of these writers should dishonour the gods whom they used to honour. Yet, though I think this absurd, I do not say that they ought to change their opinions and then instruct the young. But I give them this choice: either not to teach what they do not think admirable, or, if they wish to teach, let them first really persuade their pupils that neither Homer nor Hesiod nor any of these writers whom they expound and have declared to be guilty of impiety, folly and error in regard to the gods, is such as they declare. For since they make a livelihood and receive pay from the works of those writers, they thereby confess that they are most shamefully greedy of gain, and that, for the sake of a few drachmae, they would put up with anything.

We see here that Julian does not wish to force people to his own views, and instead wishes only to preserve the existence of his own. It is true that he never persecuted christians during his reign, but let their churches operate freely, even though they had shut down and ransacked the temples of his

forefathers. He only took away the financial and social privileges that the christians had gained, and Julian had a small handful of christian officials executed during his reign, though it was only the most absolutely obnoxious and deceitful among them which he rightfully killed. I am not in fact about to launch into an explanation about how this specific fact, the fact that Julian never persecuted people during his reign, makes Julian more virtuous than the christians, even though, by christian standards, it does. Rather, I think of it as a missed opportunity and an unfortunate consequence of his adherence to Neoplatonism. This late form of Paganism placed a much greater emphasis on humanity and tolerance than previous Greco-Roman beliefs had, and Julian took these ideals very seriously. Some contend that he only avoided persecuting christians because they had grown “too strong” already, and those that contend this falsehood also spout the common narrative christians constantly mutter amongst themselves for comfort, that is the idea that the frequent and ferocious persecutions by the emperors of old only had the effect of increasing christianity, that the more christians were killed, the more converts were made.

This common myth does not have a shred of real evidence to back it up. All literary and archaeological evidence we have shows that these persecutions, while they did happen, were incredibly sporadic, and in the rare case where they did occur, were not nearly as severe as deceitful christian writers have led us to believe over the centuries. Before the time of Constantine and his ilk, christians remained a mere fragment of the overall population, and early christianity itself was usually regarded as nothing more than an annoying urban cult for slaves and simpletons.

If the anti-christian persecutions had any effect at all, it was that they actually kept the foreign poison benign and restrained, stopping the disease from spreading further, and reinforcing the larger populations view that the ancestral ways were supreme. It is not a coincidence that christianity just so happened to start rapidly becoming more prevalent only after it was legalistically and violently enforced by the government, under Constantine and all of the succeeding emperors with the exception of Julian. I can understand those today who are totally ignorant of the history of late antiquity to believe that Europeans peacefully chose to be christian, because these people merely lack perspective, and they are solipsistically thinking of their own times, in which plenty of Europeans like christianity. But only a braindead retard would gain all this historical knowledge that I have divulged here, and still assert the moronic claim that Europe wanted to be christian while the religion was still just getting started.

The early christians constant wailing and bemoaning about the non-existent persecutions against them is highly reminiscent to leftists and jews in our own time. They groan and shriek in their fabricated pain, and then the millisecond they obtain the power they begged for, they start violently suppressing anyone that opposes them. Really, these similarities should in no way be surprising to us, as in reality the early christians were nothing more than leftists and jews from many centuries ago.

With Julian having secured victory in the west, he now sought to embark on a campaign to achieve victory where Constantius II had failed. He gathered an army and set out for the Roman east, from which he would attack Persia in a massive campaign with his army storming through the lost eastern territories and into Persia itself, while another contingent of Romans allied with the Armenians would simultaneously attack Persia from the north. In the writings of Ammianus Marcellinus there are many interesting things written about this period. Ammianus Marcellinus was a Pagan, though he was not uncritical of the Emperor, and several times he expresses his apprehension for Julian’s extremely Neoplatonic approach to things, and of Julian’s keeping of a retinue of Neoplatonist philosophers as trusted advisers. Anyone who desires a more complete account of the entire reign of Julian, should certainly read the writings of Ammianus Marcellinus. In the twenty-third book of his work, he relates one of several occurrences of bad omens before this campaign took place, this particular instance being when

the advice of Etruscan soothsayers, (who followed a more ancient form of Pagan belief) was ignored, in favour of the opinion of the Iamblichean Neoplatonic philosophers.

However, the Etruscan soothsayers, who accompanied the other adepts in interpreting prodigies, since they were not believed when they often tried to prevent this campaign, now brought out their books on war, and showed that this sign was adverse and prohibitory to a prince invading another's territory, even though he was in the right. But they were spurned by the opposition of the philosophers, whose authority was then highly valued, but who were sometimes in error and very persistent in matters with which they had little acquaintance.

The span of time just before the campaign was spent by Julian at Antioch, in Syria. This eastern city was now enthusiastically christian for the most part, being a stronghold for both christians and jews. The Antiochians had gotten used to the pompous and pretentious style of the christian emperors, which was highly resemblant of Persian despotism with it's endless court eunuchs, specious pretenses, and vain flatteries. The more cold, austere, and Pagan style of Julian was not favoured by most of the Antiochians, nor was his devotion to the Pagan gods. Despite their open hostility towards him, Julian did not enact a violent repression against them, but instead set out on his Persian campaign.

The initial part of this endeavour was successful enough, Julian quickly retook the areas of the Roman east which Constantius II had lost, and then marched unopposed, deep into Persian territory. Julian continued his march, and for the first time in almost an entire century, the Roman army managed to reach Ctesiphon, the Persian capital. The last Roman commander to achieve this, was the emperor Galerius, one of the tetrarchs, and also one of the most strongly anti-christian emperors of them all, who sacked Ctesiphon back in 299. Julian's forces won a victory against the Persian garrison that was guarding the city, and the Persians retreated back within the safety of the city walls. The only problem was that the northern forces with the Armenian allies had proved to be unexpectedly and suspiciously sluggish in their advance, and were absolutely nowhere to be seen. Knowing this, Julian realized he could not take the near imperviously fortified Persian capital with only the men he had available to him, especially with Persian reinforcements arriving soon, so he proceeded to order a retreat back to the roman east. This retreat proved very chaotic, as the Persians constantly harassed the retreating Romans, attacking them whenever possible, and burning any land which could be of use to the Romans, making provisions for the forces of Julian very scarce. One day during the retreat, while Julian was conducting reconnaissance of terrain in the distance, he was informed that his rearguard was facing a very strong attack from the Persians. Realizing this, Julian and those with him galloped at full speed to take command of and assist the threatened rearguard, but their departure was so hasty that Julian only had time to grab a shield, and was not able to put on his armour in this instance. Julian was then told while rushing toward his rearguard, that his front ranks were receiving a similarly powerful attack. Hearing this, Julian turned around and rushed to assist the frontal troops, as he deemed this matter to be of even more importance at that moment. He reached the front, where the elite Persian heavy cataphracts had just broken through the Roman line.

Julian did not only imitate the Pagan warriors of old in his words, but also in his actions. He was one of the increasingly rare instances of a Roman commander in those times that actually fought alongside his men. With no armour, he fought ferociously and like a lion against the Persian cataphracts. It was during this incredibly chaotic battle, after these cataphracts had begun to flee and while Julian and his men pursued them, when a spear was hurled, and this spear stabbed deep into the emperors thigh, seriously damaging his liver and causing intense bleeding. The wound received by Julian was not initially fatal, and he was taken back to his tent, where he was given medical care while his men continued to fight the Persians.

There is a spurious anecdote often repeated with glee by christians and leftist historians alike, first fabricated by an Antiochian bishop of the fifth century known as Theodoret, which states that Julian's last words were supposedly 'Thou hast won, Galilean'.

More honest sources tell us the truth, that Julian was very calm and content at the time of his death, and that he spent his peaceful final hours discussing Greek literature with his friends. The actual last words of the emperor Julian, as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus (who was actually there) were these-

Most opportunely friends, has the time now come for me to leave life, which I rejoice to return to Nature, at her demand, like an honorable debtor, not (as some might think) bowed down with sorrow, but having learned much from the general conviction of philosophers how much happier the soul is than the body, and bearing in mind that whenever a better condition is severed from a worse, one should rejoice, rather than grieve...Considering, then that the aim of a just ruler is the welfare and security of its subjects, I was always, as you know, more inclined to peaceful measures, excluding from my conduct all license, the corrupter of deeds and of character...And therefore I thank the eternal power that I meet my end, not from secret plots, nor from the pain of a tedious illness, nor by the fate of a criminal, but that in the mid-career of glorious renown I have been found worthy of so noble a departure from this world...

And so, on June 26th, 363, the young emperor Julian left this world, and with him, the Roman empire in its more true form. Most agree that it was a Persian spear which killed him, but there are sources from both Pagans and christians at the time which say that it was in fact a treacherous and cowardly wretch of a christian soldier within the ranks of Julians forces, who saw an opportune moment to hurl his own spear at Julian, to appease his seething and pathetic resentment against such a noble ruler, upon the instance when the Emperor was unarmoured and focused on chasing down the Persian cataphracts. Whether or not this christian "soldier" actually existed or not, the church did not condemn this supposed action at all, but they canonized him, though they also syncretized him with another christian roman soldier who had died over one hundred years previously. Ammianus Marcellinus, however, does not in fact corroborate the church version of the story, and there is no mention of a treacherous christian soldier in his account.

I myself cannot say which version is true, though neither would surprise me, nor would it surprise me if both christian and Persian alike had been colluding with each other to do everything they could to stop the Emperor from achieving any more victories.

No matter what happened, the reign of this fine Emperor was cut short. Julian was the last of his kind, and many of his subjects did not deserve him. But he was remembered with love and fondness by the many Pagans within the empire (they still made up the majority of the population at this time), and some of them even placed statues of him alongside those of the gods, and divine emperors, seemingly equating him with the status of the deified emperors of Rome's glory days, one worthy to stand alongside Augustus, Titus, and Hadrian.

Many of his writings have surprisingly managed to survive until this day, and I will now share some quotes from them, which I find to be extremely insightful, and relevant to this work. These quotations come from his polemical work *Against the Galileans*, which survives only in fragments due to every copy of it being destroyed by the church after Julian's death, and from his letter to the Alexandrians, where he chastises this capital city of christendom for their abandonment of all things that made their city great. Julian makes it clear to the christians the truth, that their unremarkable scriptures do not, in fact, improve anyone, but rather they dumb people down, and morph the individual into a kind of defective jew. He also points out the obnoxious and frequent hypocrisy of the christians, and puts forward

his theory that it was John who was the first to describe Jesus as divine, (though Jesus did not do anything particularly remarkable while he was alive) as it is only in the writings of John where this belief is made clear. He contends that christianity was in fact calculated deliberately, with the goal of converting the most depraved and impious elements of society who did not want to perform sacrifices, which require actually giving up their possessions, but instead preferred the christian way, in which they could merely be sprinkled with a little water and then receive eternal pleasure, even if they continued in their degeneracy.

Let boys selected from all of you apply themselves to the study of the scriptures, and when they arrive at manhood, if they are at all better than slaves, consider me a trifler and insane. And yet you are so unfortunate and stupid, as to think those writings divine, from which no one will become more wise, or brave, or better than himself. But those writings from which fortitude, prudence, and justice may be derived, you ascribe to Satan, and those who worship Satan!

But Jesus, who made converts of the worst part of you, has been celebrated by you for little more than three hundred years: and performed during the whole time that he lived no deed which deserves to be mentioned, unless anyone fancies that to cure the blind and the lame, and to exorcise those possessed by daemons, in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethania, rank among the greatest undertakings.

For you do not take notice whether any mention is made by the Jews of holiness, but you emulate their rage and their bitterness, overturning temples and altars, and cutting the throats not only of those who remain firm in paternal institutes, but also of those heretics, who are equally erroneous with yourselves, and who do not lament a dead body in the same manner as you do. For neither Jesus nor Paul exhorted you to act in this manner. But the reason is, that neither did they expect that you would ever arrive at the power which you have now obtained. For they were satisfied, if they could deceive maidservants and slaves, and through these married women, and men, such as Cornelius and Sergius; among whom if you can mention one that was at that time an illustrious character... believe that I am a liar in all things.

But you are so unfortunate that neither do you abide in those things which were delivered to you by the apostles; and these by those that succeeded them were rendered worse and more impious. Neither Paul, therefore, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark dared to say that Jesus is God; but 'good' John, perceiving that now a great multitude in many of the Grecian and Italian cities were infected with this disease; and hearing, as it appears to me, that the sepulchres of Peter and Paul were privately indeed, but at the same time hearing that they were worshipped, was the first who dared to assert this.

This evil, however, received its beginning from John. But who can execrate as it deserves what you have invented in addition to this, by introducing many recent dead bodies to that ancient dead body? You have filled all places with sepulchres and monuments, though it is never said by you anywhere, that you are to roll about sepulchres and worship them. But you have proceeded to that degree of depravity, as to think that not even the words of Jesus of Nazareth are to be attended to on this subject. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. [Matthew 23:27]" If, therefore, Jesus says that sepulchres are full of uncleanness, how is it that you invoke God upon them?

This next set of quotations come from Julian's letter to the Alexandrian Christians, with the order of banishing Athanasius from Egypt, for causing strife and senseless conflict between what Julian calls the diseased part of the city against the remaining healthy part, that is, the Pagan part. He chastises them for their astonishing stupidity, and their cowardice and servility towards those that they once conquered.

Your founder was a god-fearing man, Alexander of Macedon, in no way, by Zeus, like any of these persons, nor again did he resemble any Hebrews, though the latter have shown themselves far superior to the Galilaeans. Nay, Ptolemy son of Lagus proved stronger than the Jews, while Alexander, if he had had to match himself with the Romans, would have made even them fight hard for supremacy. And what about the Ptolemies who succeeded your founder and nurtured your city from her earliest years as though she were their own daughter? It was certainly not by the preachings of Jesus that they increased her renown, nor by the teaching of the Galilaeans, detested of the gods, did they perfect this administration which she enjoys and to which she owes her present good fortune.

The forefathers of the genuine Hebrews were the slaves of the Egyptians long ago, but in these days, men of Alexandria, you who conquered the Egyptians — for your founder was the conqueror of Egypt - submit yourselves, despite your sacred traditions, in willing slavery to men who have set at naught the teachings of their ancestors.

Are you alone insensible to the beams that descend from Helios? Are you alone ignorant that summer and winter are from him? Or that all kinds of animal and plant life proceed from him? And do you not perceive what great blessings the city derives from her who is generated from and by him, even Selene who is the creator of the whole universe? Yet you have the audacity not to adore any one of these gods; and you think that one whom neither you nor your fathers have ever seen, even Jesus, ought to rank as God the Word. But the god whom from time immemorial the whole race of mankind has beheld and looked up to and worshipped, and from that worship prospered, I mean mighty Helios, his intelligible father's living image, endowed with soul and intelligence, cause of all good ... if you heed my admonition, do ye lead yourselves even a little towards the truth. For you will not stray from the right road if you heed one who till his twentieth year walked in that road of yours, but for twelve years now has walked in this road I speak of, by the grace of the gods.

If we view the state of Alexandria today, it is plainly evident to us that it's inhabitants continued in their folly, and chose their own pleasure, and Athanasius the black dwarf, over Helios, which gave them sustenance, and Julian, the warrior emperor. I have one more quote of his, which describes his thoughts about the christians of his day, and also describes my thoughts about those among us who cling to christianity still.

Would not any man be justified in detesting the more intelligent among you, or pitying the more foolish? Who by following you have sunk to such depths of ruin that they have abandoned the ever living gods, and gone over to the corpse of the Jew.

The spread of christianity had unquestionably been delayed. It was only towards the end of the fourth century when all of the government sanctioning which christianity had accumulated was brought back, and some of the restrictions on Paganism were reinstalled, with the old Pagan temples and monuments once again being fair game for christians to plunder for their own monetary gain, but I will discuss this part of the timeline later, after I have introduced our next christian saint.

At this point, I will examine the church father who may be the most beloved of them all, by every one of the mainstream denominations, perhaps besides the black dwarf of Egypt.

Augustine wrote many christian works throughout his life, some of which are among the most popular christian works of literature next to the bible itself. Two of the writings he is most known for are *Confessions*, and *City of God*. I will discuss both of them, but first I will clear up any confusion about his ethnicity. He does seem to have been at least partially a Berber, but this does not mean he was white. The Berbers have become a favourite of right wing esotericists, because there exists on google images a

handful of photographs of them, in which some of them possess a European looking phenotype. Despite this, most of the Berbers are commonly semitic looking like the rest of the north Africans. There is simply no evidence at all that the Berbers were ever completely white. The Berber language isn't even an Indo-European one, but belongs to the Afro-Asiatic family alongside Hebrew, Arabic, Cushitic, and Chadic. There are several good reasons which could explain why a fragmentary minority of them today look white, though I think it is likely because of the genetic legacy that the Germanic Vandal kingdom left behind in north Africa, long after Augustine was born.

Like Tertullian before him, Augustine identifies himself openly in his work as being punic, and it is known that Augustine was one of the last writers of his age who was familiar with the punic language. How interesting, that these individuals who are peddled to us under the title of "Latin church fathers" are actually semites through and through.

The more well known of the two most famous works of Augustine is *Confessions*. This work of his is essentially an autobiography, in which he goes over his life, and explains how he became a christian. In this book we can see exactly the true character of Augustine during his young adulthood, and well, let's just say he was not exactly the Greco-Roman ideal of a warrior philosopher, but much the opposite. He was an adherent to the doctrines of Manichaeism, a dualistic belief which is effectively not so dissimilar from the orthodox belief that he eventually converted to, only after he had failed in his original endeavours of course. He lived as an utter degenerate, as one of many african immigrants which infested Roman cities, and spent his days in debauchery and idleness with his companions, several of which he admits were also africans in *Confessions*. Now, to a christian, who values empty words over actions, none of this is of any concern. So long as Augustine verbally renounced Manichaeism, and said all the right words, then suddenly he'd be worthy of being considered one of the greatest writers who ever lived. But even to these types, those who value platitudes instead of real nobility, I will point out that Augustine likely did not become a christian out of some autonomous altruistic choice to be "good", but rather he, either consciously or insentiently, became a spouter of slave morality only after he had already failed in his original goal. What exactly was his true goal in life? Well, not I, but Augustine himself, in his work *Confessions*, will tell us.

I was eager for fame and wealth and marriage, but you only derided these ambitions. They caused me to suffer the most galling difficulties, but the less you allowed me to find pleasure in anything that was not yourself, the greater, I know, was your goodness to me.

So it is plainly apparent to us that only after his true desires had been spurned, he settled for another path, to adopt a view in which everything he once craved for but failed miserably to attain somehow became morally "evil", and also where, quite conveniently for Augustine, the state of being severely deprived of power became morally "good". This is nothing other than simple slave morality. It is also highly reminiscent of a modern phenomenon where non-white immigrants flood into the west, expecting to find the same success that white people have found, but when many of these migrants arrive, due to their ugliness and social ineptitude, they find no success at all, and can only obtain a sad state of dissoluteness. Because of this, these immigrants then adopt a moralistic view of white people being ontologically "evil", simply, because we have found many successes that non-white immigrants lack.

A very disturbing thing which is found in *Confessions* is the instance in which Augustine essentially confesses his pedophilic tendencies to the readers. In the sixth book of *Confessions*, we read that his mother had planned out a marriage for him, but that this could not take place, because the girl was two years too young to be legally married. The minimum age for marriage at that time was twelve, though this by no means indicates that pedophilia was a commonly accepted thing in the empire. The truth is that

almost all girls, when they were still young teenagers, were married to youthful boys who were not that much older than the girls were themselves, for this reason the age of marriage was low compared to what it is today.

The problem is that at this time, Augustine was not fourteen, but already a fully grown man in his thirties, and nowhere near the age of this girl, who wasn't even the minimum legal age. This is the line from *Confessions* where Augustine admits his feelings —

Yet the matter was pressed forward, and proposals were made for a girl who was as yet some two years too young to marry. And because she pleased me, I agreed to wait for her.

Yes, she “pleased” him, which seems to imply heavily that he felt sexually aroused by her, a ten year old girl, or at the very least, that he had no opposition to being with her. Some dishonest christians have translated part of the line above in the more innocuous sounding form of “I liked her”, but if we examine the original Latin text, the deception of these christians becomes plain.

et quia ea placebat, expectabatur.

In Latin, this translates literally, to ‘and because she pleased him, he expected her.’ The reason that in this literal translation he appears to be talking about himself in the third person is only due to the differences between modern English and ancient Latin. Rendered properly with the rest of the sentence, it appears how I have indicated it previously in it’s entirety, in the first person. The word in question here is *placebat*. This word is the third-person singular imperfect active indicative of *placeō*, which means please, and not like. Though, even if the true translation was merely “I liked her”, it would only be slightly less questionable.

Despite this ten year old girl being “pleasing” to Augustine in his thirties, the marriage never took place. The reason being that shortly after this plan of marriage was put forward in Augustine’s narrative, he reveals that he fell into a dramatic state of despair, when the girl he had already been cohabitating with left him, and went back to Africa, though not only did she leave him, but she also left behind the bastard child she had produced with him while they were living together.

That is all I have to say regarding this supposedly illustrious literary masterpiece known as ‘*Confessions*’, I don’t consider it to be very impressive or admirable for anyone at all to confess that for the better part of their life they indeed lived as a contemptible and deeply disgusting individual, but that it’s all okay now, because they said they are sorry, and they read from the right book, and say all the right words, and that they have made the most ‘glorious’ advancement from debauched imbecile, into mentally insane old fool spouting a morality of eternal forgiveness (which only has the effect of creating even more disease), and for this ‘advancement’ they will be given eternal pleasure after their body finally gives up it’s ongoing mockery of life.

In order to now discuss Augustine’s other beloved work, *City of God*, I will have to explain the circumstances which caused Augustine to write that work, and this will allow me to return our attention to the emperors.

The emperor who Julian had named as his successor was an aging praetorian prefect, and this man sadly declined the offer. This being the case, the man who attained the throne immediately after the death of Julian was instead the woefully misnamed Jovian, a christian, and a man who seems to have been more liked simply due to his height and handsomeness as opposed to any of his skill as a leader. He instantaneously approved of a disgracefully pathetic treaty with Persia, and retired to the christian stronghold of Antioch, where he indulged in a life of dissolute hedonism. There was a big rush at that

time from all the christian sects to try to convince the new emperor to favour their interpretation, and the highways of the east were swarming with bishops of every variety trying to reach Antioch. Jovian gave his support to the orthodox faction, as degenerate and incompetent rulers in that age always seemed to do. At Antioch there existed an elegant temple constructed by Hadrian to his deified father Trajan, which Julian had added a fine library to. Jovian, seemingly on the pleading advice of his wife, in an effort to appease the christian populace after his own humiliating concessions to the Persians, had this beautiful structure burned to the ground. It was his concubines who he ordered to set the fire, and they did this while laughing. Thankfully, this boorish slave of eastern darkness died suddenly, less than one year later, in unknown circumstances. He was buried at the church of the holy apostles in Constantinople.

After Jovian there followed an emperor who can be described as mild and unextreme for the most part, this is Valentinian, who was a christian, but was for the most part tolerant towards Pagans, though it is debated whether this tolerance was genuine, or simply a way to keep things tame and subdued after the recent reign of Julian which had strongly invigorated the Pagans. Valentinian also surprisingly tried to curb the utter degeneracy of the church. While he did restore many of their privileges, he did this in a restrained manner. He only allowed bishops to have judicial authority over christians, and not over both christians and Pagans as they formerly did for a time, under Constantine and his sons. Valentinian prevented christian soldiers from being sentries of Pagan temples, and this is undoubtedly because many christians would join the imperial army simply to be able to have weapons and armour while robbing these temples of their valuable offerings, as temples with active Pagan worshippers were still widespread across the empire in those times. Valentinian did not prevent the Pagans from performing sacrifices publicly, and he refused to close the Pagan temples, despite heavy pressure from the church. A sinister and revolting practice of the bishops was to exploit helpless and vulnerable women, especially young orphan girls and old widows, by convincing them to make large donations towards the church. Since women generally are adherent to their irrational whims, and submissive towards authority figures, these women would often fall victim to the church's manipulation, and donate large sums repeatedly to the bishops. To try to stop this, Valentinian issued a law which forbid the bishops from entering the homes of these vulnerable women, and Valentinian also strengthened the laws so that even if the bishops did still manage to obtain the wealth or property of any vulnerable woman, that the donation was officially null and void, and could not be accepted. The other emperor of that time, the brother of Valentinian, named Valens, seems to have been less tolerant, and ordered a persecution of Pagans in the east. A massive number of Pagan books were burned in the squares of the eastern cities, and Valens also persecuted the friends of the emperor Julian. Under Valens two Pagan philosophers were murdered, Maximus, who was beheaded, and Simonides, who was burned. Capital punishment in the form of burning is known to most likely be the most physically painful possible death that a human being can undergo, and it seemingly all but non-existent as a punishment in our lands before christianity was forced upon us. But, the jews knew how to cater to the resentment of most degenerate of our people, and so it became widespread. Protect the degenerates that deserve punishment, and severely torture to death anyone who remains firm in the old ways. That is how it works in judaic systems, whether the title be christianity, leftism, or anything else. The decay of christianity started to accelerate very rapidly during the reigns of the emperors that immediately preceded Theodosius, though it was on the accession of the appallingly incompetent Theodosian dynasty when the attempted cultural destruction of Europe entered an even more advanced stage.

The empire was still at this time more Pagan than christian, or perhaps fifty percent Pagan, at the very lowest estimate. Theodosius favoured the orthodox faction, but he was initially tolerant towards Pagans, though this was probably to secure power without provoking the influential Pagan senate and nobility, along with the majority of the population of the empire, which was Pagan, especially in the west,

where the church had primarily only infected urban areas, with the exception of punic north Africa, where both urban and rural areas were mainly christian. I cannot possibly fathom why that is. Starting in the early 380s and going into the 390s, he began issuing anti-Pagan decrees, and these soon became the most severe and violent laws against Pagans that Rome had yet seen. He reiterated the ban on sacrifice, and then banned the form of divination known as haruspicy on pain of death. He knew that local magistrates in previous decades would almost always simply ignore these laws, so he went as far as to issue a law that criminalized the non-enforcement of anti-Pagan decrees. In 381, Theodosius decreed that any christian who had returned to Paganism was to be deprived of any rights. In the same year Pagan temples and libraries in the east were plundered and burned, and a Pagan temple in Constantinople was converted into a brothel, with two more being converted to stables. A prefect was sent in 388 by Theodosius to many of the eastern provinces, with the goal of breaking up Pagan associations there, and the destruction of their temples.

In 389 began a series of new laws produced by Theodosius known as the ‘theodosian decrees’. The Pagan holidays which were not already parasitically cannibalized by the church were made illegal. Merely visiting Pagan sanctuaries, was banned. Simply entering any Pagan temple was banned. Looking, yes, literally just looking admiringly at old Pagan statues, was banned. But christian retards with a single-digit IQ that is lower than the age of the little girl Augustine was sexually attracted to want to tell me that our ancestors voluntarily converted over to jewish stupidity.

In 390 there occurred an incident at the city of Thessalonica where a mob of the citizens murdered some Gothic soldiers and a Gothic commander who were on imperial pay. This was over a dispute involving the detainment of the citizens favourite charioteer because of allegations of either rape or homosexuality. After this man was detained, a Gothic charioteer won the races instead, and this sent the Thessalonian crowd at the hippodrome into their furious rampage in which they murdered a number of Goths.

Theodosius was enraged at this news, and initiated in retaliation a massacre of seven thousand Thessalonians in the hippodrome at Thessalonica. Not seven thousand Carthaginians. Not seven thousand rampaging hunns. Not seven thousand rebellious jews. Seven thousand Macedonian Greeks, who were his own citizens.

Now the time has come to introduce “saint” Ambrose. There exists a mosaic depiction of Ambrose at Milan today, which dates to late antiquity, and may be contemporary to when Ambrose was still alive. I will not go into too much detail, but I will say that his physiognomy speaks for itself.

Mediolanum (today called Milan) was the only sizable city in the west which still had a strongly Pagan population. Ambrose, though he was not born in Mediolanum, took it upon himself to relocate to that city. He seems to have not been very deeply entrenched in the church hierarchy, but he was hastily made into the bishop of Mediolanum after their previous bishop died. He tirelessly advocated for the orthodox faction, and was vehemently anti-Pagan and anti-arian. Augustine was present in the same area while Ambrose was bishop, and Ambrose played a significant role in Augustine’s conversion from gnosticism to gnosticism-lite, that is, to christianity. It was Ambrose who was the very bishop that baptized Augustine.

After the “great” christian emperor Theodosius had proved horrifically incompetent, giving enormous concessions to invading Goths, pathetically begging and bribing them with wealth and territory, and then massacring seven thousand of his own citizens, what did Ambrose do?

Well, he followed the version of “justice” promoted by the orthodox faction, and he merely forgave him. After he demanded that Theodosius did eight months of “penance” of course.

Yeah, seven thousand Macedonian lives... eight months of asking your imaginary friend to forgive you... I totally see how that balances everything out, it makes perfect sense. Not only was this failure forgiven, but Theodosius was later made into a saint. But someone like Julian, the last emperor who actually maintained the empire, and lived up to a noble character? Not worthy of any praise, according to the orthodox faction. Why? Because he just didn’t say the right words of course. Sure, he made no major mistakes and was sheerly heroic in almost every way, but he just didn’t sacrifice his dignity on a jewish altar, and weep for forgiveness like an effeminate cowardly fool.

Oh, but Theodosius the incompetent dolt, and mass murderer of his own people? Well, he bowed down to the jewish corpse. Forgive him, send him to heaven forever, make him a saint.

Those who support the orthodox faction usually are those who simply don’t know any better, I was once this way. Those who do know these things, but still cling to their fantasy, must be genuine cowards, or perhaps they are afflicted by both cowardice and stupidity.

Also in the year 390, hordes of fanatical, mentally ill christian monks stormed out of their foul hiding places, and flooded into many towns and cities throughout Egypt and the east, where they destroyed countless libraries, altars, and temples, while killing any Pagans who stood in their way. A worthless wretch known as “saint” Theophilus enacted heavy persecutions against the Pagans of Alexandria, and he had the Mithraeum and the temple of Zeus there destroyed.

The western Pagans still had a lot of strength left, so they now put up a defiant fight against Theodosius. The christian puppet of Theodosius ruling in the west was an ‘emperor’ called Valentinian II. Two men, one of them a Frankish general in the Roman army called Arbogast, and the other a Roman teacher of grammar and rhetoric called Eugenius worked together, and were able to have Valentinian II killed. Eugenius was then proclaimed emperor. He and Arbogast seemed to be nominally christian, but their actions were in favour of Pagans. They had the Altar of Victory restored once again to the Curia, and Pagans in the west were allowed to freely exist again. Eugenius appointed a Pagan called Nicomachus Flavianus as praetorian prefect in Italy, and Eugenius also renovated the indescribably beautiful temple of Venus and Roma, the largest temple in all of Rome. This structure originates from the glory days of Hadrian. It was the biggest and most impressive structures such as this one which were often the prime targets for christian plundering, as these very tremendous structures which contained the most raw materials, and thus, the most monetary profit. The colossal temple of Serapis on the Quirinal Hill in Rome was one of the first victims of this, and this gigantic temple today is known only from fragments, though these fragments alone are some of the most impressive pieces of marble in the entire city of Rome.

Those who have been paying attention should be able to predict the following events. Eugenius pursued friendly relations with the east, but Theodosius did not feel the same way. So began yet another Roman civil war, the Pagan west against the christian east. The army of the west was composed of Gallo-Romans, Franks, Alamanni, some Goths, and the elite Herculians, which had been supporters of both Magnentius and Julian. The eastern army of Theodosius had been heavily weakened due to a previous defeat by Valens against the Goths at Adrianople. Because of this, Theodosius filled up almost half of his missing ranks with Goths, some twenty thousand, along with a multitude of Hunnic cavalry.

When the two armies met at the Frigidus river, Theodosius immediately sent in all of the Goths as a wave of cannon fodder against Eugenius. The Goths fought very well, but were heavily cut down inevitably, and took disastrously high casualties. After the Gothic shockwave had fizzled out, the army of the west was weakened, and Theodosius sent in the rest of his forces, which eventually were able to achieve a pyrrhic victory with very heavy losses. Eugenius was executed, and Arbogast took his own life, in the tradition of the European aristocracy, that is of death before enslavement. Obstinate christians who assert the doltish eastern idea that suicide is always wrong in every circumstance simply have no concept of nobility.

Modern scholars like to obnoxiously assert that these civil wars were not really a case of Pagan against christian, but the evidence is very plainly against them. The error of these leftist scholars is that they have inherited a solipsistic worldview from jews and christians, where they cannot fathom a world in which ancestral tradition would be important enough for people to fight and die in massive numbers for.

There are some who credit Theodosius and Ambrose as being those who are truly responsible for the destruction of the cultural heritage of Europe, even more so than Constantine. Ambrose had also influenced the emperors just before Theodosius, that is Gratian, and Valentinian II, who had started once again issuing firm laws against Pagans, when the period of about a decade had passed after the death of Julian where Paganism was relatively tolerated. But now, the last western army had been defeated. Back in Rome, the Pagans were once more defenceless, and the theodosian decrees were back in effect, with many more anti-Pagan laws being issued in addition to the decrees. In Rome the Altar of Victory was removed from the Curia, for the last time. I will now reiterate some of the decrees which were now in place, so that it could not be more abundantly clear what level christians had to go to in order to make our ancestors leave their blood inheritance behind.

Sacrifice was a capital offence, property of those executed was given to the state. Divination was banned on pain of death. Pagan temples were closed on government order. Entering temples was banned. Temples were destroyed on government order, or were made defenceless to plunder by christian bishops and other peasants, for building materials or monetary gain. Pagan priests were now executed. "Idols" and statues were smashed to pieces. Sanctuaries were destroyed, and visiting ones that were unharmed was banned. Looking at statues was banned. Refusing to enforce these laws was banned. The order of the Vestal Virgins, a deeply sacred group of priestesses which had been established all the way back in the early days of the Republic was disbanded. The sacred fire which they kept burning in the temple of Vesta was extinguished.

The reason for the priestesses careful attention to this fire, was an ancient tradition which closely ascribed the keeping of this fire to the fortunes of Rome. The extinguishment of the fire symbolized imminent disaster accordingly.

Pagan participation in the government was banned. All the bloodless forms of sacrifice, that is the offering of incense, the pouring of libations, and offerings of every other kind, cakes, weapons and armour, gold and silver – all were made a punishable offence, if one was caught, their property was confiscated, and any who failed to reveal or denounce offenders were threatened with punishment. The death camps at Scythopolis were reopened, and thousands of Pagans from across the empire were murdered there. The holidays of the gods were abolished. The polemical writings of Pagan philosophers like Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian which had refuted the judaic cult were banned and destroyed. On several occasions, it was decreed that any Pagan literature at all was to be banned and destroyed. Even the timeless Olympic Games, along with the Phythian Games, the Nemean Games, and the Isthmian Games –

were all abolished as “idolatry”, the entire ancient Olympiad Cycle had been ended. The Actian Games in Rome were abolished as well. The final recorded date of the Olympic Games was in 393. There are several more things I could mention, but I will stop this here.

These laws were not only issued against Pagans, but also against any christians not adherent to the orthodox faction (but not jews of course, there were no laws prohibiting their existence). In Constantinople there were many Goths, who were arians. In reaction against these laws, the Goths defiantly rose up and fought back, and in their insurrection almost achieved the destruction of the imperial palace with the death of the emperor. Despite this strong attack, their defiance ultimately resulted in the outright extermination of all the Gothic soldiers in Constantinople, and the destruction of their arian church in the city, with all of those who had taken refuge inside, even women and children, being forcefully prevented from escaping the structure, and then burned to death as the church was consumed in flames.

There were some laws passed regarding jews by the church, though they were not restrictive, but very beneficial to jews. In 393, it became illegal to attempt to ban judaism. In 396, jewish merchants were allowed to set their own prices as they wished. In 397, insulting jews was banned. In 412, jewish synagogues were ordered to be protected, and of course, while Pagans were facing capital punishment or forcefully converted on mass, jews were spared from all of it.

Anyone who still supports christianity or the church after reading this is nothing more than a jewish puppet. What do you have left? I have obliterated your scriptures and annihilated your church. You have nothing left to keep you clinging to a jewish corpse other than your own cowardice and stupidity. So, it's time to snap out of it, if you have even a little amount of bravery or intelligence, that is.

One year after the defeat of Eugenius and Arbogast, Theodosius fell ill and died, the year now being 395. But his dynasty continued to reign. Early in the fifth century Theodosius II issued more decrees against Pagans. It was now illegal for Pagans to plead their case in court. Pagans were now disqualified from being soldiers as well (clearly to prevent them from forming yet another army and challenging the authority of the orthodox faction), and in 435 Pagans and heretics were simply put to death openly, with judaism now being the only faith that was completely legal aside from christianity. Did you read that, right wing christian morons? Your worthless and incoherent cult was in complete harmony with the jews who you claim to be the enemies of. You know why? Because those same jews created the nonsense that you cling to, and to this day they brag openly about how they created it to destroy your people, and your culture. They created it to take advantage of your weakness, and you continually submit in pathetic servility to them, every second that you continue to remain christian.

The first person who read a rough draft of this book I have written was a christian, born in the same year as myself. I really believed in him, and I thought for sure that this information would get him to snap out of it. He did say that my writing was skillful, and that this book of mine was the best attack against christianity that he had ever seen. But unfortunately, his weakness, and his less than advanced IQ ultimately prevented him from leaving his worthless faith, because he just couldn't philosophically fathom anything more than the idiocy that gave him immediate comfort without effort. Yes, because the alternatives, the non-christian concepts like evolution and reincarnation were just too scary for his autistic mind (he was literally diagnosed with autism), he clung to jewish lies. He told me indignantly that I now hated christians more than jews.

Do you know what? I actually do. Because although the jews are our natural enemies, they have still proven themselves far superior to the christians. The jews admit who they are, the christians do not. The jews remain firm in their ancestral traditions, the christians do not. The jews know their enemies, and

attack their enemies unapologetically, the christians do not. The jews look out for their own people, the christians do not. The jews win, the christians lose. So yeah, I do hold more contempt for christians than I do towards jews, and this is because christians are far more worthy of contempt. The jew is simply a natural enemy as I have said, it is like a hyena to a lion. The christian on the other hand is like a weak and defective lion within a pride of lions. A weakling that insists that all the other lions must become as weak and as stupid as he is, and that the leading doctrine that all the other lions should follow actually comes from some random questionable and deceitful hyena from a long time ago, and not a collection of superior lions as was believed since time immemorial. So yes, christianity is a more poisonous threat to our race. In antiquity, when we as Pagans battled jews, we were victorious. Since we have been made christian, jews have been victorious, except in brief cases such as National Socialist Germany, in which christianity was rejected.

“Durr, but muh humans aren’t lions! Youz can’t make that metaphor! Duuuuurr!”

I can, and I just did. Deal with it, moron. In fact it makes a lot more sense, and is far more insightful than anything your insipid jeebus managed to gabble out. Another thing – you should know that as dimorphic mammals, we actually are far more similar to lions than we are to the abomination of an idea you call “god”. This closeness between us and other mammals is a provable, demonstrable, infallible, and objective fact. I am right, and you are wrong. So cope harder, play some more videogames, watch some more anime, watch some more porn, and forgive me harder, you degenerate moron.

This entire period of the late fourth and early fifth centuries was the most abominable period that Europe had probably ever seen at that point, with the orthodox faction now having absolute impunity to finally enact all of it’s built up resentment it had accumulated over almost four centuries. Just think of who they really were. Think about the ones that I have spoken of here. Cuckolds, doltish thugs, psychologically unwell drifters, rapacious fools, pedophiles, familicidal monsters, self-castrated freaks, vengeful punics and black africans, et cetera (this description is just as accurate when describing modern leftist mobs). Now consider that these are just the ones that the church considered good enough to be documented and widely published. Now, imagine the character of the common ones, the undocumented ones, the vulgar ones that made up both the worst of them and the majority of them. Now imagine if these people had unlimited freedom to do absolutely anything they wished to any Greek or Roman who dared to continue following anything other than the newly government sanctioned, repulsive jewish cult.

Each significant church had large amounts of monks under their command that would tend to the place and go about their monkery. They now received government funding, so they could purchase food, clothes, and weapons. These monks could now gather themselves into huge mobs, and roam about wherever they wanted to, destroying anyone and anything that they wanted to (this had already been occurring to a smaller degree since Constantine [though Julian put a stop to it during his reign], but now was unrestrained and commonplace). Read this account from the Pagan author Libanius, one of the last of his kind, in which he appeals to his emperor for help against this black clad mob, help, that never arrived.

This black-robed tribe who eat more than elephants and, by the quantities of drink they consume, weary those that accompany their drinking with the singing of hymns, who hide these excesses under an artificially contrived pallor – these people sire, while the law yet remains in force, hasten to attack the temples with sticks and stones and bars of iron, and in some cases, disdaining these, with hands and feet. Then utter desolation follows, with the stripping of roofs, demolition of walls, the tearing down of statues and the overthrow of altars, and the priests must either keep quiet or die. After demolishing one, they scurry to another, and to a third, and trophy is piled on trophy, in contravention of the law. Such outrages

occur even in the cities, but they are most common in the countryside. Many are the foes who perpetrate the separate attacks, but after their countless crimes this scattered rabble congregates and they are in disgrace unless they have committed the foulest outrage...Temples, Sire, are the soul of the countryside: they mark the beginning of its settlement, and have been passed down through many generations to the men of today. In them the farming communities rest their hopes for husbands, wives, children, for their oxen and the soil they sow and plant. An estate that has suffered so has lost the inspiration of the peasantry together with their hopes, for they believe that their labour will be in vain once they are robbed of the gods who direct their labours to their due end. And if the land no longer enjoys the same care, neither can the yield match what it was before, and, if this be the case, the peasant is the poorer, and the revenue jeopardized.

Try to view things through the eyes of a Pagan at that time. You live in the countryside, because the cities are simply too dangerous for you to enter now. One day, a savage mob of drooling nigger slobs, drunk, and with full bellies, and singing their obnoxious hymns (like how packs of feral niggers today love to blare their monkey “music” wherever they go) storms into your village, and starts tearing down your temples and shrines. You cannot fight back, because extremely high taxation from the christian emperors has made your village impoverished and unable to afford anything at all, let alone proper weapons or armour. The high taxes that you pay go directly to the church, who do not pay taxes themselves, and who instigate this detestable rabble to come unprovoked to your home and start tearing apart the sanctuaries of your gods. You know that if you do fight back with your fists, they will kill you immediately, because you have heard about what they’ve done in neighbouring villages and estates. Under threat of death, you decide to simply stay put, and go through the motions that the monks demand of you at the new church, while still secretly believing in the old ways. At least this way, you can still live your life, and have a wife and children, even though things are much worse than they once were, and you are much more likely to be killed by famine or plague.

Add a few generations to this, and you can see how the Pagan beliefs of old really faded away. Not by spontaneous, autonomous choice, but by blatant physical force, and nothing more.

To anyone who still would spout the insipid and braindead lie that our conversion was voluntary, I’ll point out to you that the fact we are here at all proves that our progenitors were merely going through the motions at church, much like the Pagan in the scenario I’ve just described. They weren’t even reading the scriptures either, as during the vast majority of those times, it was essentially only the monks and church hierarchy that had access to the bible. When scripture was read to our ancestors, it was for a great period of time read in a language they could not understand (local language bibles have only been widely available to us for little more than four hundred years). Had our ancestors been truly devout christians, they would not have devoted their lives to warfare and making love, these actions which genuinely are the ones that kept Europe in existence, despite the fact that much of the leadership of the continent in those dark ages was in the hands of foolish monks and bishops who were too inadequate to participate in battle or to have families, and so sought refuge in the church. Those very few among our ancestors who actually loved Jesus are the ones who actually followed his commandments, and they became celibate monks who did not pass on their genetics. I don’t deny that many of our progenitors in those ages were christians, to be clear. But the truth is that they were not devout christians by any means, and they did not truly love Jesus at all. As I said, if they did, then none of us would be here.

Most of these christian rampages simply went unrecorded in history, but many of them were written down after they had taken place. A mob of monks lead by “saint” Martin of Tours enacted mass

burnings and destructions of temples and sanctuaries in Gaul. There was destruction of temples in the east and of remaining ones in north Africa. The temple of Apollo at Delphi, which contained the renowned oracle of Delphi since deeply ancient times, was destroyed. The Eleusinian mysteries were desecrated and ended. The ninety-five year old Pagan hierophant at Eleusis, a man named Nestorius, who was the last man to preside over the Eleusinian Mysteries before their end, correctly announced the predominance of mental darkness over humanity, after a christian mob had tried to lynch him.

The temple of Olympian Zeus, at the centre of Athens, was burned and almost completely destroyed (it was so large that they seemingly couldn't destroy all of it, so it partially survives still today). The Parthenon at Athens was sacked also, with the Athenian Pagans being persecuted. A particular hotspot for these monk rampages was the Levant, which had more temple destructions than any other area of the empire, with every single temple in the city of Gaza being razed. I cannot imagine why that is. In Ephesus once stood the wonderful temple of the venerable goddess Artemis. This temple, which was one of the seven wonders of the world, was shut down, eventually being destroyed down to its foundations, though one tremendous column has been reconstructed from the ruins there today. The name of Artemis was erased from all inscriptions within Ephesus, though the rapacious inhabitants of that city eventually suffered from arabic raiders, the Ephesians definitely finding out at that point that confessing jeebus does not make a city, people, or empire any better off, in any way at all. The prevalence of arabic raids in the dark ages was due to the fact that the beloved teachings of jewbus had weakened all of Europe nearly to the point of destruction. A combination of severe raids and the buildup of swamps in the area of Ephesus eventually caused all of the Hellenistic settlement of Ephesus to be abandoned entirely.

In Syria, the fanatical christian bureaucrat Maternus Cynegius, under encouragement from his hysterical wife, and with the assistance of the bishop and "saint" Marcellus and his horde, set out to have every temple, shrine, and altar in that land levelled. At one point during this mass attack, Marcellus had his mob set fire to a temple of Jupiter. Marcellus then cowered away in his tent as his horde was setting fire to another temple (he was hiding away because he most certainly was aware that some Pagans did still fight back). Marcellus certainly thought he was safe in that instance, but a band of Pagans soon accosted him in his tent – thereafter Marcellus himself was thrown into the fire he had set at the temple of Jupiter, and in those flames Marcellus burned to death. Middle eastern countries today tend to be quite restrictive when it comes to archaeology, but in the northern provinces of the empire, which have almost no written sources for this time, there is abundant physical evidence which reveals many burned out and shattered Pagan structures, and plenty of hastily buried Pagan objects of worship.

The Pagan inhabitants of the Greek islands seem to have been especially vulnerable, and particularly despised by the church. A very high number of Pagans were exterminated by the church on the islands of Samothrace and Cyprus, with the number of murders on Cyprus reaching into the thousands. The bishops responsible for these mass murders were canonized.

In 395, the eunuch and rigorous christian prefect Rufinus, under the authority of the Theodosian emperor Arcadius, directed a vast horde of baptised Goths into mainland Greece. There, under the encouragement of christian bishops, these idiotic, bungling, and depraved slobs went on an unprecedented rampage, sacking and burning a vast collection of places across Greece, many of which were still quite Pagan. Megara, Corinth, Argos, Nemea, Sparta, Olympia, and many others. The Pagan inhabitants of Greece were slaughtered and enslaved, with their temples being burned, and the Pagan priests being immolated.

There were the glorious Goths of late antiquity, to a large degree. They accepted invitation from rapacious monsters to slaughter innocent and defenceless Europeans. How brave those Goths were. These

types exist all too commonly among us today, and their weakness and stupidity is directly correlated with the disaster that now afflicts us. Beer drinking, foul-mouthed, sportsball watching, jeebus worshipping dolts. How can I not have contempt for these types?

During this era, the empire saw it's first ever eunuch consul, a man named Eutropius. This is undoubtedly a progressive feat by contemporary liberal standards, though this is not surprising, because contemporary liberalism and christianity are the same thing after all. In 399, the eunuch Eutropius indeed became a consul, after having previously served the christian power structure as a gay sex slave, pimp, valet, and palace chamberlain. He was friends with the repulsive deceiver and christian fanatic known as "saint" John Chrysostom, who defended Eutropius when he eventually fell from power.

One recorded incident of this time was when the leader of a mob of Egyptian monks who had been plundering and destroying temples told the victims this- "I peacefully removed your gods... there is no such thing as robbery for those who truly possess Christ." This is a very typical line of thought we see in leftists and christians, and generally anyone who bases their beliefs on the denial of reality, in order to gratify their desires for hedonism. They deny any fault on their own part, while they simultaneously gaslight their victims.

In 401, it was decreed that any christians who maintained good relations with Pagan relatives were to be excommunicated, even after their deaths. In 406, John Chrysostom ordered the temple of Artemis at Ephesus to be destroyed, this temple along with many others were able to be dismantled with finances that Chrysostom had collected from the donations of wealthy christian women. This phenomenon is in fact no different than the wealthy women of our own times who finance leftist groups, as it is these effeminate groups, christians, liberals, leftists, et cetera, who cater to the rapacious desires and irrational whims of women. In 408 it was made illegal for anyone to privately own Pagan sculptures, and "saint" Augustine had hundreds of pagans murdered at the Roman settlement of Calama, in Numidia. In 409, astrology was made a capital offence.

During this time, the Roman military completely collapsed. Since Constantine, a century of civil wars between the Pagan west and the christian hordes of the east had all but completely erased Roman manpower and morale, and the Goths were now especially bitter towards the empire after Theodosius had sent huge numbers of them to be slaughtered against Eugenius, and after the persecution they had received due to their "heresy". All out invasions took place, and the Theodosian dynasty, now under the wrongfully named emperor "Honorius" could not stop the Goths. Rome, so long as it was Pagan, was nearly indestructible. The last time it had been sacked was all the way back in the times of the early Republic, over eight hundred years before the fifth century. Now, in the year 410, only thirty years after christianity had been made the official state religion, and a mere sixteen years after the sacred fire of Vesta was extinguished, Rome fell after three sieges, to the Visigoths.

I want to put aside the common esotericist myth that all of the barbarian sacks of Rome were just completely peaceful events where the Germans simply showed up, and did absolutely nothing. The reality is that these arian christians murdered, they raped, and they smashed up buildings (mostly old pagan ones of course). It's simply true.

I don't consider it to be some kind of magnificent achievement of glory either. The Germanic sacking of Rome was an event worthy of our lamentations, and not of the praise that is lavished upon it by right wingers all too often. Oh, how incredible, what a high accomplishment, they showed up and rampaged through a state which had already been warring against itself for one hundred years, and in those civil wars had slaughtered it's best men. Only after a total of three sieges, they did something which they never even came remotely close to while Rome was still Pagan. Sure, they were physically stronger

than we are today, but the truth is that these Germanic men were not the most admirable of our progenitors. They converted to a foreign religion (the Goths and Vandals seem to have converted to arianism without forceful coercion, unlike most of Europe) and abandoned paternal instincts, they accepted foreign coin to slaughter their own kind, and when hordes of moors and huns, threats which were far more severe to them than Rome ever was actually arrived, they completely failed to defend their own lands, and ran for safety behind the borders of the empire, where they united with the remaining imperial forces to narrowly achieve victory.

The sack of Rome in 410 is what leads us back to Augustine, and I will now return to the point in my narrative about him from which I digressed.

City of God (the original title given to it by Augustine was '*The City of God Against the Pagans*') is essentially Augustine's attempt to answer the common accusation which had been generated by many people that was having a strong affect on christians all over the empire, that is, the (true) accusation that the empire had now become degenerate and weak due to the influence of christianity, and consequentially that Rome had been sacked because of it's abandonment of the ancestral ways. *City of God* is really an extensive rambling where he pulls out every single bad christian argument he can muster, a worthless appeal to faith being his core argument (from which he created the title of his book), that we should care more about the imaginary city of the jewish god than we should about the real city of Rome. I don't expect a puny pedophile to care much about the greatest city in the world, but it really is revealing that in *City of God* he sheds very little or no tears for the immense destruction in the city, or for the suffering of it's inhabitants, and it is abundantly apparent that his main goal is nothing other then defending his absurd doctrine of solipsistic pleasure which has unquestionably caused the empire to fall into calamity.

An insultingly stupid tactic Augustine resorts to is to simply attempt to flip the argument around on the Pagans, and ask them why it is that their gods did nothing to stop the city.

As for those who insult over them in their trials, and when ills befall them say, "Where is thy God?" we may ask them where their gods are when they suffer the very calamities for the sake of avoiding which they worship their gods, or maintain they ought to be worshipped

Pagans had been totally restricted by this time, so there was no possible way for any pagan to give this imbecile a response. I would have responded perhaps by pointing out that the proper worship of Pagan gods had been literally banned on pain of death, thanks to Augustine and others of his kind, and that this sack tellingly only happened right after Pagan worship was violently suppressed. This fact gives heavy support to the Pagan side of the debate, and annihilates Augustine's feeble point. I would also point out to him that Pagans suffered calamity not because of "sin", but because of the lack of what he calls "sin". What I mean is that that they were too tolerant, and gave undue mercy freely to christians for too long.

Notice how Augustine here is performing an identical gaslighting strategy to what the Egyptian monk mob leader said, which I already pointed out just before I began explaining the military collapse of Rome. He completely denies any fault of his own, despite blatant evidence which proves that his actions have been disastrous, and then he blames the victims. This is the only argument that a life-denying, faith based ideology can come up with.

Another very cringe-worthy argument that Augustine tries to use is to point out examples from Pagan literature where cities were sacked, such as the well known fall of Troy in the *Iliad*. He asks why

Minerva did nothing to the Greeks after they sacked Troy and looted her temple. To an idiot this might seem like a half decent argument, aside from the fact that it is being dismissive of what has just happened in Rome and is trying to shift to focus onto another event, but to someone who has a brain, it is very easy to see how this argument of his utterly collapses.

The reason it does not work, is because Augustine fails to understand Indo-European beliefs, and is viewing Paganism merely as his own universalistic gnostic beliefs, but with the names of Pagan deities instead of the name of his fabricated jewish deity. Paganism was more particular, and was not disapproving of conflict with other tribes. What he does not realize is that Pagan deities do not make absurd pretensions claiming to be on the side of all mankind, or on the side of eternal peace. It was understood that they were not egalitarian, and that they were not obliged to always favour those who offered to them. Very evident in classical literature is that the Greeks had a more fatalistic view of nature that closely corresponds to observable reality. The christian view does not correspond to anything other than Levantine fantasies. Augustine does not see that the gods were not viewed as universalistic all loving beings like his own christian god is. Christianity promises peace but delivers nothing other than pain. All of Rome had now been under the subjection of the orthodox faction, yet anyone could see that the new god was seemingly making things worse then they had ever been, (if he existed at all) even though his scriptures clearly say that things would get better if more people came to the one 'true' god. The Pagan gods do not make promises of eternal peace, yet they deliver not only peace, but also victory in battle far more effectively than the god of the jews does. Moreover, one who has actually bothered to read the *Iliad* would've certainly noticed the fact that the goddess Minerva in that book sides openly and strongly with the Greeks, and not the Trojans.

I think that is all that needs to be said for *City of God*, yet another work of genius from the punic pedophile beloved by Catholic, Byzantine, and Protestant christians alike. Augustine is utterly despicable and obnoxious for brushing off the horrific suffering that his doctrines have clearly caused to a once fine empire, and then attempting to throw the blame onto the victims he himself is instrumental in attacking. This dishonest, perverse, degenerate, and deceptive wretch of a gibbering african bishop died in his homeland, spending his last days in a sorry spectacle of weeping and slaving "repentance".

Now I will turn our attention once again towards Alexandria. This fervently christian trade capital was the home of some of the most atrocious acts of this dark era, committed by the black christian mobs that resided there. Athanasius was long gone, but the current patriarch, the hideous slob called Theophilus, was just as fervent for the orthodox faction as his predecessor was. As soon as the Theodosian laws were being passed, he instantaneously initiated his authority to demolish the now defunct Serapeum, an incomprehensibly magnificent temple complex built in the namesake of the Ptolemaic Greek solar deity, Serapis. For some unfathomable reason, a jewish mob had in fact already tried to destroy it in the past, but they were unsuccessful, as the emperor Hadrian obliterated their revolt, and had the temple restored completely. The Serapeum was described by Ammianus Marcellinus thusly: *...conspicuous among them the Serapeum, which, though feeble words merely belittle it, yet is so adorned with extensive columned halls, with almost breathing statues, and a great number of other works of art, that next to the Capitolium, with which revered Rome elevates herself to eternity, the whole world beholds nothing more magnificent.*

For Theophilus there was just one problem – there were still Pagans in Alexandria, many of them from the aristocratic families of Greek and Roman descent, and there were still enough of them to the

point where skirmishes were not an uncommon thing. The Pagans were not going to simply let their most impressive and beloved temple be destroyed, not without putting up a fight.

The Pagan men fortified themselves within the Serapeum complex, and prepared for a siege. Theophilus organized his black hordes, and they proceeded to storm the Serapeum. Eventually the Serapeum was overrun by the teeming black mob, and the Pagan defenders within were defeated. When the christians first entered the temple itself, none of them dared to lay a hand on the lifelike statue of the god, as such a wonderful image of divinity still held power over them even in this dark time. They were instigated by Theophilus, and then the statue was broken to pieces, and the temple destroyed with the help of the army, who now it seems focused on destroying their own empire instead of defending the imperial borders. The Serapeum included a vast library of classical literature, which was also destroyed.

After the storming of the Serapeum, Theophilus had the remaining other temples in the city levelled, and images of the gods were melted down to make into pots and utensils. At the site where the Serapeum once stood, there lies today some fragmentary remains of the structures and a few semi-intact statues, and fully intact is a single colossal column of the Corinthian order, which I think may have been left up by the christians simply because it was too large to remove. The pillar was not part of the temple itself, but was a triumphal column erected near the temple by Diocletian during the tetrarchy. It is complete, other than the statue of the emperor wielding a sword that once stood on top of it, which is gone. Over the site of the Serapeum the christians built a church, but that worthless structure would collapse before the end of the seventh century.

The successor of Theophilus was his nephew, Cyril. Born in a small settlement deep within the Nile delta, Cyril was of lowly origins, but received an education and entered into the hierarchy of the orthodox faction. He was incessantly contentious, and even though his faction had ascended to total power, he still managed to find ways to clash with the imperial government.

Where he reigned in Alexandria, there were still Pagans, though they had now lost all of their temples, and were completely outnumbered. One among these last Pagans was Hypatia, who was a female Neoplatonic teacher in Alexandria during her life. She was born into the Ptolemaic Greek upper classes of the city, her father being the mathematician Theon. Theon was the head of a school called the Mouseion, and it is Theon's edition of the *Elements* of Euclid which is the version which has overtaken all other variations of that work. The Mouseion was a prestigious and exclusive school, which taught Plotinian Neoplatonism, instead of the newer Iamblichean Neoplatonism. Hypatia taught at this school the works of Plato and Aristotle, as well as mathematics and astronomy. She herself was a Neoplatonist, and like her father preferred Plotinus over Iamblichus. According to contemporary sources of the time, her works actually surpassed those of her father, and other philosophers of her age, but for obvious reasons none of her writings have survived to our time. Hypatia was noted for her physical beauty as well as her eloquence, even by some writers of the time who were christians, and many christians were educated in the Mouseion where Hypatia and her father taught.

Hypatia had remained in Alexandria, and this would prove to be horrifically fatal. As I have said, "Saint" Cyril of Alexandria had somehow managed to clash with a government that gave full power to his ideology, much like leftists today who still fabricate non-existent problems against the governments who provide them with all of their authority. Among the mindless horde of negroid christians under Cyril's command, a rumour spread that Hypatia had been using Pagan rituals to influence Orestes. Orestes was the Roman prefect of the city who had escalated a feud against Cyril and his mob after one of the christian niggers had attempted to kill Orestes by throwing a rock at his head. Hypatia was in contact with Orestes,

and she still was very influential within the city, and with members of the aristocracy from across the entire empire, who came to the Mouseion to learn.

All this was too much for the christians, so during lent, an entire mob of negroid subhumans, lead by a lector named Peter, gathered themselves into a street horde and swarmed around Hypatia while she was in her chariot. They apprehended her forcefully. Hypatia then was killed, though not just with a simple cut of the throat or stab through the heart. The manner of her death is so monstrous that even secular sources typically do not describe it. She was stripped naked, then severely stoned and beaten with roof tiles, and then the christians used sharpened oyster shells to flay her fair skin from her delicate body, after which they tore her limb from limb, paraded her body parts through the city, and then burned her remains. That is how she died. At the hands of a degenerate mob that would defend the most vile of prostitutes, simply because said prostitutes confessed jeebus verbally. Yet these monks would murder beautiful Hypatia, an aristocratic girl who they did not even deserve to look at. They killed Hypatia, simply because Hypatia was too noble to ever debase herself by submitting to the corpse of the jew.

If you are christian, then the men who killed her are the ones you side with, while you renounce your ancestors. You choose subhuman niggers over your own blood, because you are either too ignorant, or too cowardly to get over your fear of a non-existent punishment that jewish deceivers have planted in your mind. If you think that I am merely spouting a false narrative from some 2006 historical fiction novel, or any other cope you can come up with, then you should really read more, and think nothing of the kind. I am repeating what the primary sources say. The typical christian response to this information is a pathetic denial of any correlation between their doctrines and this horror. Instead of taking one moment to reflect, and realize the fact that their obscenely stupid beliefs do in fact encourage degeneracy and decay, they will simply say “erm they just weren’t real christians”. It is very easy to explain why this pitifully fallacious argument does not work. Christianity, despite what christians may screech, has absolutely no firm foundation. Working from unfalsifiable reasoning, upon incoherent, insane, and contradictory scriptures, christianity in fact only causes people to engage in vice with increased impunity. This degeneracy is inevitable, and is a consequence of the most fundamental doctrines of christianity. If we look at peoples actions over their words, we see this is true. Christianity promises eternal pleasure in exchange for nothing other than empty words. Hence why every single christian engages in constant acts of “sin”, and every single christian also thinks that they are saved, and that they will be the ones who go to heaven. Even the ones among them who are thoroughly degenerate still think this. Oh, and not to mention the fact that the church fathers which christians worship with unrelenting vigor did in fact condone and encourage the horrific acts I have described. Augustine himself was alive while all this was going on, and he not only approved of, but openly encouraged and participated in the violent persecution of Pagans (but not against the Jews of course, he wrote that they were the chosen people of “God”, and should be allowed to dwell in Roman lands).

Since the only form of argumentation christians can resort to are unfalsifiable statements or various examples of circular reasoning, you end up in a situation where a fifth century Alexandrian mob can provide just as theologically valid of an argument that they are “true” christians as your local Lutheran congregation can in contemporary times. Neither side is grounded in reality, and so neither side can form a real argument. We, on the other hand, can admit with honesty that there have been many examples of bad Pagans, or bad white people, because we are not cowards before reality or truth. Christians cannot even manage this, but flee into denial.

The murder of Hypatia and many other Pagans eventually proved to be very similar to scenes that would be played out in the distant future, with the rise of christianity's spiritual successors of liberalism and communism. Horrific mob murders of aristocratic girls were enacted in eighteenth century France, and in twentieth century Russia.

Many see the death of Hypatia as the end of classical antiquity, but if I were to place a firm end date onto the Greco-Roman age of Indo-European dominance, it would be somewhat later, during the reign of Justinian which I will examine shortly.

Remaining Pagans within Alexandria now fled the city, and many went to Athens, where (for now) there was still the Platonic academy functioning and teaching the writings of Pagan philosophers, even if all of the actual practices of Pagan worship had been banned. One year after the death of Hypatia, the many remaining Pagans in the Anatolian land of Bithynia were exterminated, with the vile hermit responsible for that massacre being canonized.

There is an account of what happened to one pagan who stayed in Egypt into the latter part of the fifth century. This man was a writer called Horapollon Nilous, who wrote commentaries on ancient Greek literature, namely the poets Homer and Sophocles, and he also wrote the *Hieroglyphica*, which survives today, as well as a history of Alexandria, and a work called *Temenika*, on places consecrated to the gods. He was one of the very last leaders of the ancient Egyptian Pagan priesthood, and lived in a city north of Alexandria. Horapollon had to flee his home after christians had falsely accused him of plotting against them. They destroyed his temple to Isis and Osiris, and eventually captured him. Horapollon was then subjected to torture, until he "converted" to christianity. I believe that had he not given a fake conversion, he would've been heinously slaughtered in the same way that Hypatia had been, as she never in her life offered any false conversion, or showed any sign of ever converting, and the christians, always despisers of anyone who is honest, brave, and intelligent, killed her for it.

The western half of the empire limped onwards for only a few more decades, barely managing to defend itself from total destruction at the hands of the huns, before it finally was reformed into a Gothic realm. During these times after the death of Hypatia and before the reign of Justinian, there were three rulers who actually tried to protect European heritage within the empire. These were Majorian, Anthemius, and Theodoric. Majorian is widely praised and beloved, and this is seemingly for good reason. He appears to have been the last of the western emperors who was able to give a wholehearted and genuine attempt to restore Rome to some level of glory. In his efforts to do this, he implemented several laws. One of these was an edict protecting old Pagan temples and monuments, which had been being plundered almost ceaselessly since the time of Constantine. Offenders were to be punished by mutilation, with their hand being cut off. Majorian instituted another law which I will discuss, because it gives us insight into a highly disturbing effect which christianity was causing within the empire, I mean the severe lowering of birth rates. The new christian faith had placed all value into the immaterial kingdom of "god", or in other words, into subjective and meaningless sensations of personal pleasure, and consequentially, christianity had ultimately occluded the value of family, empire, or race. The obvious result of this was a sharp rise in rapacity. This was observed in the increasingly common practice of christian families forcing their daughters to enter the church as nuns, which would mean that the daughters would not marry, and not have to pay any dowry, thus the christian family would be able to keep their precious money. The girls of course would not be faithful nuns, as they were sane and healthy girls with natural desires, and so they would still engage in sexual activity, but they would now do it

outside of marriage, and it would not result in the production of children, as they had to keep up the façade that they were good nuns. This and other christian changes in social dynamics had caused the birth rates not just in the city of Rome, but across the entire empire to plummet. Majorian sought to stop this, and had families forbidden from sending in their young daughters to be nuns, by forbidding any girls to become nuns before they reached the age of forty. Majorian implemented the death penalty for adultery (in direct opposition against the teachings of Jesus), which shows us that adultery had become utterly rampant in the christian empire. A law was also issued by Majorian which prevented anyone from being ordained as clerics against their will, which reveals to us that not only did christians have to force others to participate in their cult, but that they also had to force many of their own newly acquired laity to be clerics. Evidently not too many people were enthusiastic about becoming a celibate drudge going through the motions of the “sacraments” and spouting off semi-coherent jewish slave morality from the pulpit. Majorian was murdered in suspicious circumstances, by the deceitful Germanic pretender called Ricimer.

Anthemius obtained emperorship several years after Majorian. He seemingly was a crypto-Pagan, who was planning a Pagan revival for the empire in the footsteps of Julian, who Anthemius was related to. Anthemius had minted onto coins the old image of Hercules slaying the Nemean lion, and he appointed the Pagan philosopher Messius Phoebus Severus as Consul. Though Anthemius did try to restore the empire, he was ultimately slaughtered, losing his life by the machinations of the same rapacious general who murdered Majorian.

Theodoric the Great was a Gothic king who reigned over Italy after the western empire had fallen, and he also implemented laws protecting the old Pagan buildings from plunder, and even initiated a rebuilding program of ancient structures that had been damaged. This would prove to be futile, as the byzantine emperor Justinian had his own plans for Italy.

Life in Italy under the Goths was stable, and a welcome break from the atrocities of the orthodox rulership. It should be noted that almost all devout christians would state that these Goths were not christians at all. The reason they maintain this is because the Goths were adherents of arianism, and this faith effectively made Jesus into something approximating a demigod who was subordinate to god the father. This makes arianism inherently more hierarchical and ordered, this monarchical form of christianity being in direct contradiction to the trinity of the orthodox faction, which is fundamentally egalitarian, and tries to place mere man on equal footing with god. It is only natural that these Ostrogoths would be more attracted to arianism, a more ordered form of christianity. In the Italian Gothic realm, old Latin inscriptions and Roman motifs were still minted into coins, the legacy of antiquity was defended, and the old aqueducts as well as the many wonderful baths were fully functioning. Even the old Roman senate was still in operation.

Now, if Constantine is the one who initiated the process of the death of antiquity, then it was his sixth century spiritual successor Justinian who finally killed it.

Regarding Justinian, there is simply too much for me to relate here. But I will point the reader in the direction of a fine primary source that can explain this topic more eloquently than I can. The writer Procopius of Caesarea was the imperial chronicler of that time, and he wrote extensively on Justinian and on the empire in his times. His *History of the Wars* and especially *The Secret History* both reveal everything very clearly.

Though Procopius lived through and witnessed the events of late antiquity which he describes, he wrote in the antiquated style known as the second sophistic. This form of writing kept to traditional Attic Greek, and was heavily inspired by the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides. It was a purist in its rules, and so Procopius did not introduce any new vocabulary into his writings, and kept strictly to classical

Attic Greek. Instead of using the word “churches”, Procopius used the word “temples”, et cetera. The writing style of the second sophistic was in it’s dying days during late antiquity.

In the *History of the Wars* we read of the apocalyptic scale of the Gothic wars. Justinian’s invasion of Italy (with his Byzantine armies being assisted by huns, Slavs, and some Germans) utterly obliterated the strength that still remained in that land. The Goths fought with all of their ability, but were simply overwhelmed in the end, ultimately beaten by a Byzantine force under the command of the eastern eunuch general called Narses, who was also a pious orthodox christian. In the times after Byzantium had gained control of Italy, the decay implemented by the orthodox faction accelerated to an unseen degree, and even the Goths would be converted over to the orthodox faction as well. The remaining ancient buildings for the most part were left to crumble or were plundered, all of the old infrastructure itself ceased to function, birth rates plummeted still further, the black plague (which would become a recurring problem for Europe through the rest of the dark ages) made it’s first appearance and cut down what little population was left, and the sun itself literally ceased to shine (probably due to the eruption of one or more large volcanoes in that time), causing extensive crop failures and famines. Rome had gone from an indestructible and indescribably beautiful city of one million citizens in the tetrarchy before Constantine, to a destitute community of just thirty thousand vulnerable people huddled together for survival among desolate, labyrinthine, and apocalyptic ruins near the Tiber river. All knowledge and understanding of the past was lost, and with it, all comprehension of the present, and the future. Within a few generations of the Gothic wars, most people could not even remember who had built the sprawling ruins which surrounded them. It was thought that the Colosseum was a fortress constructed by a wizard with an army of demons, the wizard being the Roman Augustan author Virgil, according to the christians. Virgil was an outstanding poet who was honoured in antiquity, but was now made by the vile church into a figure of disdain, and a malefic necromancer in the eyes of the populace.

What was now known more than ever was plague, death, and the depraved madness of the malicious cult of the jewish corpse. This was the state of Rome (and most of Europe), just a little more than one hundred years after Theodosius had made christianity the enforced state religion of the empire. After Theodosius extinguished the sacred fire in the temple of Vesta, Rome would be sacked not one, not two, not even three, but five times, before the sixth century came to an end. In all of the countless centuries before this, more than one thousand whole years, Rome had only been sacked one single time.

It is difficult to put into words the reality of the truly nightmarish life which had befallen the individual citizens of the empire itself, these citizens who had found themselves unfortunate enough to live under the total control of the orthodox faction. To summarize life for Europeans during the reign of Justinian, imagine if all of the atrocious events I have been describing since the rise of Constantine were multiplied and centralized more than ever. Court intrigue, financial corruption, scheming and torture, as well as the total and incessant promotion of trinitarian orthodox christianity, the foreign poison which did severely denigrate the intellect of Europe. Justinian was a voracious and devoted supporter of the orthodox faction, not even christians deny this (in fact, they typically laud and defend him). For a closer look at this irrevocable horror, I recommend once again that one should read *The Secret History* of Procopius. I also reiterate that these days were indeed the culmination of what Constantine had started, this was the completion of his vision for a new eastern empire, which was nothing like the old one in the west. Justinian initiated one final massive persecution of Pagans, and forcefully closed down the Platonic academy at Athens. Near the end of his reign, he staged a mass burning and destruction of Pagan literature and artifacts in the hippodrome at Constantinople, seemingly as a symbolic final goodbye to victory and sanity. The old senate of Rome, the timeless aristocratic institute founded by Romulus himself, was disbanded in 603, after functioning for well over one thousand years.

Now, lofty antiquity was dead, and the dark ages had begun. Yes, they were indeed the dark ages. Right wing esotericists as well as leftists love to assert that they were actually just fine, and a great time, but these deceivers are as idiotic as they are deceptive. In reality they were not just fine. Europe was never in a worse state objectively, in all of recorded history, before or after the dark ages. We will soon examine this more closely. First, I will briefly explain the origins of the “the dark ages were actually great” myth. This lie started being propagated commonly by mainstream academia during the time of the “refugee” crisis in Europe, nearly ten years ago. This was done evidently with the goal of making people more open to the idea of mass migrations into Europe, and nothing more. Right wingers, ever unlearned, and ever desperate to uphold their precious christianity, latched on to this myth and have held closely to it ever since.

The term ‘dark ages’ is not a recent invention either. This term was in fact first implemented by Europeans of the medieval era, while the bodies of their own brethren were still freshly dead from the black plague. The dark ages were actually a golden age? Yes, I suppose they were, for moors, mongols, and arabs. But the golden age of one race is the dark age of another race. For our race, these were truthfully the dark ages.

I will now present in detail some of the changes in European culture which were fully realized at this time. In architecture, beauty was effectively eliminated. Even christians, in their depictions of what they call “heaven”, tend to use Greco-Roman Pagan architecture, because this architecture holds universal and objective beauty. Only a diseased slave would find anything to dislike in it. After christians had destroyed this beauty, they threw up inferior utilitarian structures in their place. Yes, these simple buildings do look better than modern architecture. But if we take one moment to think deeply we can see that they are one and the same, the only difference between them amounting to time alone. The only reason that christians didn’t use brutalist concrete or cheap sheet metal for their buildings, was because they couldn’t. So they just built jagged and blocky structures out of wood and stone instead. Or in some areas such as Britain, where the working of stone itself had been entirely forgotten, mere wood and earth were used. I suppose there was the rise of Gothic architecture, which I can admit is beautiful, but this was crafted near the end of the medieval era, and by people not of the same stock as the early christians. It also is not beautiful in the same way that Greco-Roman architecture is. The Gothic has the morose beauty of shadows, overcast skies, and winter. It is darkly beautiful. The Greek on the other hand is the beauty of victory, clarity, and magnanimous sunlight. It is a more lighthearted and honest beauty. Another thing to note is that there were never entire cities built of Gothic architecture. For the most part it was just one magnificent structure built among clusters of more humble ones, that is more or less until the renaissance began. The Greeks and Romans did have entire cities constructed in the fashion of their unrivalled architecture, and they had many of them. The sight of Rome itself was enough to inspire it’s soldiers to be loyal to it until the end. Many christian monks who visited Rome while it was still intact compared it with heaven. Nowhere can we better observe the contrast between classical Pagan and dark age christian architecture than between two famous structures which both still stand today. These are the Pantheon in Rome, and the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. The Pantheon was first built all the way back in Augustan times, by Agrippa. It’s current form is a renovation completed by Hadrian. A temple to all the gods, it has never been destroyed, though christians have long ago plundered all of it’s statues. No one can comprehend it, no one can truly know it’s power, unless they have stood beneath it’s columns, and walked through it’s colossal bronze threshold as I have. It’s wondrousness is exactly the Greco-Roman combination of austerity with unbreakable power and rightful authority. It is pure power and authority itself. It’s dome has never collapsed. Now let us look at it’s utter opposite, the Hagia Sophia, built by Justinian, in place of another church which had been burned down by Justinian’s own citizens, which itself was built over yet another even older church built earlier which had collapsed. Upon viewing this

structure one can see that is a manifold and alien looking mess. It knows no concept of order or harmony at all. It is simply a sprawling, disquieting, rapacious mass of materials. The interior is equally as disharmonious and confused, and in typical christian fashion many of the columns are in fact stolen from a Pagan building, the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus in this case.

Don't try to play dumb with me, and say that the Hagia Sophia actually looks just fine, christians. It's a confusing, alien, and semi-coherent structure. A worthy house for your falsehoods to be preached in. Even you could admit that when people imagine your heaven, they think of classical architecture that Pagans built, and not what your rapacious emperor Justinian built to his fake "god" jewbus.

The Hagia Sophia well demonstrates how christian architecture and christianity in general lost not only the purity, but also the authority of pagan Greco-Roman architecture and culture. Even if we imagine it without the corner towers that have been added by muslim turks, it still retains a look that is unequivocally eastern, and despotic. It's dome has collapsed several times, some of them even before it's conquest at the hands of Islamists (and one collapse even occurred while Justinian was still alive), who have made it into a mosque, which it still functions as today. The dome of the Pantheon in Rome, which is even larger and heavier, has never collapsed.

Regarding art, it also was almost entirely removed from Europe. The old arts of sculpture and painting which pertained to realism and nature were gone. As I've said, by the hands of christians, but I will now elaborate further on their specific method of vandalism. When they didn't destroy the statue entirely, their method was to break the nose of it, and then throw the remains away. Sometimes further mutilation was performed on the image. Curiously, the christian practice of breaking the nose of a Pagan statue is in exact alignment with the jewish talmud, which gives instructions to the jews regarding the destruction of gentile "idols", stating that to break their power, the nose must be broken, as it is the nose which allows the idol to breath, live, and empower the gentiles. The talmud also states that the gentiles themselves must take these actions, even if they are tricked into it, as the jews cannot do it for them. How curious is that, christians? It's almost like your entire pathetic cult is simply a malicious deception created to destroy you through your own fear and idiocy.

There are many examples of christian mutilation of European art that I could display, but I will list just one specific instance here. At Athens there has been discovered a marble head of Athena, her fair nose broken, gentle eyes gouged out, and a crude cross carved into her forehead. Scratching two crude lines onto each other is about the most advanced act of creativity that inferior subhumans are capable of, it is only natural that these types should love christianity the most. The resentment of vile and worthless slaves always seeks to clash with beauty and superiority.

In place of the Pagan realistic and admirable form was promoted a deeply contemptible and hideous imitation of art, reminiscent to our own degenerate modern "art" of today. This new christian style was highly abstract, symbolic, and malformed, again much like modern "art". One who has looked on the subterranean and diseased images of old christian icons and mosaics will know what I am speaking of. The third dimension itself was seemingly lost entirely, and now art was viewed in the warped and abominable forms of christ, his mother, and the saints, in jagged, rigid, and unnatural poses, painted crudely onto planks of wood. These deadened husks supposedly representative of the divine, always staring directly forth with a hideous and sickly trance-like gaze towards the viewer, and not naturally elsewhere, as the old Pagan statues and paintings did. The few statues made of emperors and saints at this time show the same disturbing decay of all form and proportion. Even the imagery on imperial coinage devolved into judaic abstraction. On the portraits of the emperors the natural and pure laurel wreath, a crown made only of a Mediterranean plant, which was worn by the emperors of Rome's glory days, was

replaced starting with Constantine by the pompous pearl diadem, a symbol of oriental despots. If a place like christian hell theoretically existed, then surely it would be the decrepit and disjointed forms of early christian iconography that one would find there, even in it's most hidden and twisted caverns.

This is the christian depiction of the divine – stout, blocky, stiff, rigid, repetitive, hexed, stubby, angular, heavy, stunted, misshapen, deformed, degenerate. In short, a complete rejection of the classical Pagan style and it's verisimilitude. I will turn our attention to a specific example of christian imagery. There is something very disturbing going on with one of the oldest known depictions of christ, the byzantine era icon commonly called christ “pantocrator”, found in an Egyptian monastery. If his ill-formed, creepy posture was not enough to immediately repulse you, I advise you to take a closer look at the image, and realize that he is quite literally a deformed monster. With your minds eye, draw a vertical line running directly down the middle of his face and through his body. With your hand, cover up one half of him, and look at what is visible of him, then remove your hand and place it over the other half, and examine what is visible of him once again. If you have a brain, you will notice that the christian “artist” responsible for this image very obviously painted one side of his face in one manner, and the other side of his face in a very different manner. The left side looks, meek, unremarkable, and plain. The right side looks malicious and sinister, in a way that is particularly semitic. Note as well that the meek left side is the side which holds up the hand beckoning the viewer forward, as if to lure an unsuspecting victim in with promises of eternal delight at no cost. The malicious right side however, is what clasps the scriptures of the jews, the primary instrument used to implement corrosive poison into the minds of anyone unfortunate enough to be lured in.

What is adjacent to these outward alterations was the degeneration and stunting of the European mind itself. The very way that we view reality was maimed, and warped into a monstrous concoction which still infects the minds of most of our people. Any sane notions of causality or natural laws were seriously harmed. This comes down to the irrational christian idolization of libertarian free will, an obsession which Europeans did not have prior to christianity. The Pagans, Platonic and otherwise, did indeed often hold to a belief in free will on some level, though it was not to the same absurd and monstrous degree that christians do. The extreme belief in absolute free will which christians (and most people today) hold to effectively eliminates any concept of cause and effect, and thus causes people to be stupid and ineffectual.

If everyone has absolute free will, then everything in this world is absolutely free. If everything is absolutely free, then everything is incomprehensible chaos, and nothing more. Everything in a world of absolute free will is simply a social construct, which exists in name only, and can therefore be deconstructed. In a Pagan deterministic view, and in real life, every action is caused directly by a previous action. So, if a people are defeated in battle, the deterministic system allows for one to examine why that is. We can look back and see what causal factors initiated the disaster, and learn from those errors. That is what I am doing in this work. In the insane, stupid, and pathetic christian view of libertarian free will, the only reason for any error or defeat in this universe among human beings is inevitably that they “choose” for it to happen. Which is obviously an unfalsifiable and obnoxiously stupid proposition. No one chooses to be a loser. No one chooses defeat, and no one chooses decay. These are all things which are explained by identifiable causal factors, even when they happen to christians. What is at the root of this christian obsession with libertarian free will is itself a typical underlying theme with christians, I mean cowardice, especially cowardice before the harshness of reality. They are too stupid and cowardly to possibly ponder a world where they will not have an eternally pleasurable afterlife, so they fabricate a pathetic husk of a god that is only good, and can only do good. This inevitably also makes their god into a malicious idiot, who allows his creation to suffer endless horrors because of a vain and idiotic notion of giving people

their precious absolute, libertarian free will. But christians have no problem worshipping a malicious idiot, as long as they get to keep their pleasure fantasy. The American libertarian and modern liberal egalitarian freedom cults are direct growths from this christian root.

“Oh, but if we had no free will like the animals, we would just be robotz!!!”

If you solipsistically look at beautiful animals within the natural world and genuinely think ‘wow, they are such stupid inferior robots, I’m so glad I’m a morally superior human with muh free will which allows me to be meek and forgiving’, then you are the problem, not me. You only show that you hate reality, because you are a coward within reality. So you flee into a fantasy that jews gave to you, because they know that it plays into your cowardice and stupidity.

“Oh, but I don’t heckin hate them, I just think I’m morally above them, because jews told me so!”

Sorry, not good enough. You either admit you have no judaic moral superiority over nature, or you are a disgusting jewish puppet. Understand that jews don’t hate jeebus. They adore him, they finance big budget films about him, and they openly brag about how they deceived you through him. What jews really hate is nature and Europeans. That is the point of their whole ideology, “healing the world”, as they call it. So stop cucking for them, it’s embarrassing.

Our very concept of time also was altered by the plague which spread from the jewish corpse. Time previously was viewed as an immutable and cyclical thing. The progressive idea that the future will be radically different than the past is a revolutionary impulse which was completely absent from the ancient world, which presupposed a cyclical nature of time. It is a fact that there is no firm revolutionary political philosophy prior to christendom, because there simply was no concept of nature which could accommodate a worldview which anticipates a future that is wholly and completely different than the past.

Christianity distorted our perception of the distinction between the sacred and the profane as well. When the presence of the divine is no longer identified within a specific time and place, let’s say in a poplar grove consecrated to Minerva on her festival day, but now within anything and everything, the distinction between sacred and profane is abolished completely. Now god was seen as being present in all things. If god is identified as a mere human baby of judean origin, with all the same weaknesses and bodily functions as any other human baby, this means that these mundane things are then elevated to the status of the divine. This shift has only two outcomes, neither of them good, and I mean that it either makes everything sacred, or it makes nothing sacred. This abolishment of our ancient, discriminatory paternal instincts inevitably substituted a superior nobility based on battle selection for a crafty theocracy based on deception, intrigue, bribery, and everything else that is impure and contemptible. Christianity, far from being threatened by modern liberalism with it’s goal of levelling hierarchies, is the very ontological condition required for modern liberalism, because christianity levels every hierarchy.

The most insidious lie of ‘imago dei’ was enforced, this doltish obscenity being at the root of all egalitarianism, and inevitably abolishing any distinction between races and even between gender. If every single human without exception is made in the image of “god”, that means that the image of god is multiracial, androgynous, deformed, retarded, and weak. Even in scripture itself it is heavily implied that god is androgynous, and this is done as early as the opening chapters of *Genesis*. When he creates humans it is stated that he created them in his image, male and female. It logically follows from this that his image is both male and female, as long as both were created from the same image.

The bizarre judaic story and rendition of “divinity” is a vastly different thing indeed from the Pagan divinities which were firmly masculine gods or firmly feminine goddesses, embodying various natural aspects of masculinity and femininity respectively.

We again see the androgynous nature of the jewish deity later in the old testament, when he openly changes his pronouns to female ones.

“That instance in scripture is not referring to god!”

Oh really? Then who is it referring to? Is it the Pagan female goddess of wisdom Athena? Who you call a demon? I don’t think so... Is it just some vague concept of ‘wisdom’ which you conveniently fabricate for this occasion only? Well then, where does this ‘wisdom’ come from? Doesn’t all wisdom come only from your god? If it originates purely from your god, and it is female, as your “infallible” scriptures claim, then your god has both male and female components, and is therefore androgynous. Even the catechism of the catholic church itself admits that their god is exactly like this, as it says that he is “neither male nor female”.

“But he appeared in human form as a male, so therefore he is one.”

I suppose as a matter of pure technicality Jesus was a male, if he existed at all, but if we look at his actions in scripture we can hardly call him ‘manly’ in good conscience. He did not fight gloriously in battle, but advocated strict pacifism. He did not breed a wife and concubines to produce a powerful progeny, but he proclaimed that men should be infertile and mutilate their reproductive organs. Many of his followers have faced worse physical tortures than he allegedly did, and they have also shown more mettle and sternness during their deaths than the Jesus character did in the gospels.

If anyone else in this world acted the way Jesus did, right wingers would rightfully call that person a cuck, and a weakling, and an idiot, and a leftist. But because this ancient leftist in question has the title “Jesus” slapped onto him, and because he promises right wingers eternal pleasure, right wingers abandon their principles and make themselves despicable.

We know already that eunuchs had gained unprecedented power within European government, but it was also claimed by christians that literal eunuchs were among the highest ranks of the heavenly hierarchy, which inherently implies that there is something divine about being an infertile husk. Though, what else can we expect from an orientalist cult which describes a “perfect afterlife” as being a state of absolute stasis, in which the only activity is the worship of an androgynous jewish abomination? In this “heaven” there is no conflict, no romance, no gender, no differentiation of any kind at all. Angels were considered to be eunuchs, especially in the east. Examine this passage from the writings of a byzantine monk about his vision of “heaven”, where he states openly that the residents of heaven are androgynous.

At the edge of the town we came to a wonderful palace, and we entered a hall as broad as a stone’s throw. From one end of it to the other stretched a table of porphyry round which many guests were reclining. A spiral staircase, situated at one end of the hall, led to an internal balcony. Two eunuchs, resplendent as lightning, appeared on this balcony and they said to my companions, “Let him also recline at the table.”

Christianity is not only proto-leftism, but it is nihilism too, because it denies any value or beauty within this life, which is real life, and only places any true value on the supposed “next” life. Any system which denies the value of this world, or states that it can only have true value if it is “healed” or “cleansed”, is inherently nihilistic.

In leftist fashion, prostitutes were idealized as well. I've already covered how christianity removed the death penalty for adultery, and how during the ascension of christendom to power there was a catastrophic rise in adultery and a severe lowering of European birthrates, but I now want to highlight the very prominent place that many adulterous and disingenuous women occupy within christian hagiographies and early writings. It is clear that so many early christian women professed to be pure towards their god, but in fact obtained most of their real pleasure while in bed with Pagan men. The mother of Constantine, "saint" Helena, was a christian, though her husband and the father of Constantine, Constantius I, was indeed a Pagan – and one who was part of the tetrarchy, which enacted the great persecution. Evidently the violent slaughter of her fellow christians at the hands of her Pagan husband does not seem to have prevented Helena from letting him enjoy her lustfully, or from her enjoying him in the same way. The mother of Tertullian was an african christian woman who was willfully bedded by a Roman centurion, Tertullian's father. The mother of Augustine, "saint" Monica, was also an african christian who married a Pagan man, the father of Augustine. A woman named Marcia was the favourite lover and mistress of the Pagan emperor Commodus, (this means that she must have been extremely good to him during their physical intimacy, because he had no shortage of girls) and she was a christian girl as well. It seems that early christian women received their heaven and ecstasy through the virile bodies of Pagan men, and not through the deceased body of christ.

Though there is nothing in scripture which alludes to Mary Magdalene being a prostitute, christians still found a way to make her into one, so that they could idolize what they thought should be idolized. This glamourization of adulterous girls is part of the process of training men to accept these women as the absolute standard. Under Paganism men and women were married together when they were still teenagers, and they remained together. Christianity, by dethroning the man as the authority over his wife, and replacing him with the proto-leftist hysterical jew that is the jesus character, destroyed the natural balance of things which kept European relationships strong. Under Paganism concubines largely belonged to the greatest warriors and rulers, those who actually deserved them. Under jesus today, concubines only belong to degenerate thugs and worthless drug dealers, subhumans whom we are no longer allowed to liquidate, because fevered christian sentimentalists have eradicated the death penalty from our lands.

Let's not forget "saint" Theodora, the wife of "saint" Justinian. Theodora was herself a former prostitute, and she worked diligently during her reign to implement feministic policies favouring prostitutes and adulterous women. Her close friend Antonina was also an ex-prostitute, and the wife of the byzantine general Belisarius.

Yes, I am aware that within scripture Paul directly says that it is somehow just fine for christians to marry non-christians. The clear truth is that he did this not out of obedience to "god", but because he knew all too well that this practice would gain more converts, especially from weak men submitting to their hypocritical and hysterical christian wives. Just because Paul says that it is okay, it does not make it any less obscenely hypocritical or repulsively cowardly.

Yeah, sure, says the christian, have nothing to do with Belial at all... Unless he happens to be your boyfriend, then you can get even more intimate with him than you can with jesus. Christ, since he is always watching, will simply watch with pleasure as you are bedded by a follower of Belial. Do christians even understand basic human communication? As far as I know NOTHING does in fact mean NOTHING. Have NOTHING to do with Belial should mean having NOTHING to do with him. If a christian girl lets Belial repeatedly bed her to the point of natural ecstasy, does that not qualify as having SOMETHING to do with Belial? SOMETHING, which is the opposite of NOTHING?

Whenever christians actually manage to give an earnest attempt to follow their own laws, one among them always accuses the earnest one of the “sin” of “legalism”, which, as far as I can tell, simply means giving a stronghearted and genuine attempt to follow the commands of scripture. I don’t recall the word “legalism” ever being used in the new testament, and this entire ridiculous concept seems to have merely been fabricated by christians in order to make themselves feel better about the fact that they are utterly incapable of following the very rules they attempt to enforce onto everyone who is not themselves.

But how can any of this be surprising to us? It is highly possible that this entire movement was literally the product of an adulterous jewish woman – as according to Celsus, it was Mary who slept with the Roman soldier Pantera, thus cuckolding her jewish husband, and giving birth to Jesus, who would go on to defend his mothers behaviour throughout his ministry.

“But he said go and sin no more!”

Yeah, well I’m sorry to be the one to point this out to you, but “go and sin no more” doesn’t work. You christians know this better than anyone else, as it is you who continually and knowingly engage in a certain behaviour involving your hand, over and over again, no matter how many times you repeat the sad excuse of “go and sin no more”.

Christian women in modern times certainly emulate their predecessors. It is apparent to all that there is no group of women which is guilty of hypocrisy more than christian women are. That entire sorry spectacle of a mass phenomenon known as “born again virgins” should make this undeniably clear. Christian women enact all of the same sexual behaviours that honest girls do, and christian girls even get tattoos and piercings – going even further than many non-christian girls, yet the christian girls deny any flaw in themselves, and think because they confess the name of a fictional jew that they are above girls who are honest about who they are. All this is to say nothing of divorce rates, of which christians, and especially protestant christians, have an overwhelmingly high rate, well above that of any other religion in this world, and I admit that though I knew their divorce rates would be high, I did not think that they would be so absurdly high as they are. The divorce rate among protestants is actually even higher than it is among those who claim to be atheists or unaffiliated. But again, let us not be surprised. This fact should be expected, as we know that Jesus hates strong families, because he makes it clear in his own scriptures. The very lowest of the divorce rates belongs to the Hindu Dharmic religion, followed closely by Mormons, who are not considered to be “real” christians by other christians, seemingly because Mormons dare to place a strong emphasis on temples, genealogy, and family, whereas the true christians care only about their faith, that is, their fantasy of eternal hedonism.

Regarding the European family structure, there is nothing in our history which has destroyed it more thoroughly than christianity did. The general conception is that capitalism or industrialism has destroyed the European family, and placed us into the atomized condition that we now find ourselves in. This is partially correct, as liberal capitalism has largely put an end to the existence of the nuclear family (or is about to do so), but this ultimately fails to see the circumstances which allowed for capitalism to thrive in the first place. Pre-christian societies all over the world tended to be primogeniture tribal systems which were bound into unity under the laws and customs of the group. Many societies around the world today, even advanced ones which are more powerful than we are, still have this system largely intact. We formerly had this as well, until christianity was foisted onto us. Not just since the industrial revolution, but since medieval times, the birth rates and marriage rates have been consistently lower in western Europe when compared to the rest of the world. As well as this, the numbers of women who marry at a later age, acquire property, and enter the work force have also been consistently higher in western Europe than anywhere else. The medieval era also, contrary to popular belief, saw the commodification of land

itself (it was now even legally being sold without the approval of the aristocracy), land being something that could not just be bought and sold in a Pagan tribal kinship society, in which all of the land is controlled by a network of interrelated aristocratic warrior families. Within the older Pagan system, women could only increase their status and wealth through marriage, an act which would continue a patrimonial lineage by producing an heir. Women who marry late, work for themselves, and freely buy property were almost non-existent under the old patriarchal, tribal society of Paganism. It is in truth not the birth of capitalism which caused the end of kinship, rather, it was the end of kinship which caused the birth of capitalism. Yes, the Europeans of medieval times did trace their lineages, but what we find with them is that they for the most part did not have extensive bloodlines, the oldest families among them being only able to trace back their origins to occluded figures from the ninth century. There are few topics which are so obscure as the origins of Europe's medieval noble families. This is noteworthy because it is in direct opposition to the strongly Greco-Roman and generally Pagan dynastic tradition. It was the vast lineages of the European aristocratic families which served as the foundational aspect of all Pagan European society, especially in Rome. These families however were not to be found in medieval Europe. The small, disconnected nuclear families with no care for dynasticism or tribal customs (which are so prevalent in modernity today), had in fact already been propagated and widely established throughout much of Europe during the middle ages, long before the industrial revolution.

The reason for all of this is very simple, and it comes down to the christian dogmatism that our predecessors were subjugated under, and it's inevitable consequences. Our ancestral Pagan traditions were very much built around a relationship with nature and reality itself, as opposed to being focused on faith or belief in an indefinable concept which violates and defies reality and sanity. Our Pagan beliefs provided a very powerful foundation on which our ancestors could construct a robust and patriarchal social order. Christianity was anomalous and revolutionary in ancient times, as it directly assaulted the old social order of patriarchal kinship, by contending that every human being had a degree of divinity within them, regardless of race, gender, or class, and that each individual was of the same divine image, resulting from their creation. This inevitably initiated unmediated conflict against the old aristocracies, who claimed that their lineages went back countless generations, and ultimately to deities from the pantheon of gods and goddesses. This old aristocratic order held that some were genealogically divine, and thus, socially superior.

The christians in late antiquity took an extremely strong stance against any form of marriage which did not result in the creation of disconnected christian nuclear families which relied only on the church, and the christians also fought against any existing customs which could strengthen the old Pagan familial structure. Starting when the orthodox faction (thanks to Theodosius) gained total power, existing familial customs which had maintained a robust Europe for millennia were severely mangled. Firstly, divorce was no longer allowed. As I have said, in Pagan Rome it was only men who had the right to divorce, not women. This was actually a good thing, as it is women who primarily initiate divorce almost every time, and not men. There was never a divorce epidemic in Pagan Rome, because by nature most men do not typically want to get divorced. Women are naturally fickle and irrational, and when they have the option to divorce, they almost always will find an excuse to, even in a marriage with no severe issues at all. By just banning divorce outright, the church actually made the problem much worse, because the restriction they installed removed patriarchal power, and lead society closer to the opposite of the Pagan way, this opposite is what we have right now, where thanks to christianity. In our times, women have all the power in marriage, while men have none at all. The inevitable result is abject desolation.

Divorce was not the only way in which our ancestral marriage customs were maimed. Thanks to the church, widows were no longer allowed to marry, and this in combination with massacring huge

numbers of our men in endless late antique civil wars kept our birthrates down even lower than they already were, because now, whenever a woman's husband died, she legally could not remarry and have more babies. Adoption also was also banned, causing the many orphans who had lost their parents in civil wars, famines, or other calamities to become alienated and mentally unsound, often being shut away in churches, nunneries, and monasteries where they would inevitably be pushed into a life of celibate infertility. Perhaps most importantly, the marriage of cousins was banned by the church.

“OMGGGGGGG YUO ACTUALLY SUPPORT COUSIN MARRIAGE LOLOLOLOL YUO ARE UNIRONICALLY DEGENERATE!!!!!!11!!11!!1”

Yeah, I knew that this would be the most controversial point of the entire work, more so than any “blasphemy” I have uttered elsewhere. Like it or not, the marriage of cousins and the producing of offspring between them was an extremely important and crucial part of our ancestral Pagan kinship societies. If you are European, and your ancestors were any more noble than slaves, then you absolutely are descended from this manner of reproduction to a considerable degree. These marriages were widespread and absolutely indispensable to the functioning of ancient European warrior aristocracies, and they were hardly dysgenic as well.

When a common, unrelated couple produces offspring, the likelihood of any genetic abnormality is 3%. Want to know what percentage it is when first cousins reproduce, that is, the closest cousin relationship which can possibly occur? Do you think it is 80%? Maybe it is 60%? Or perhaps 40%? None of these are anywhere close. In reality, it increases only by one percent, to 4%, at the low estimate, and up to 6%, at the high estimate. Also keep in mind that the cousin marriages enacted by the Pagan nobility were very often between second and third cousins, where the probability of offspring abnormality is even lower than it is between first cousins, to the point of being nearly indistinguishable from that of unrelated couples.

The ruling aristocracies of Rome had their ancient marriage dynamics and customs destroyed by the pestilent new cult, and naturally this caused the structure of the nobility itself to swiftly become ever more eroded and disintegrated, until the old Greco-Roman families were completely disbanded by the beginning of the dark ages. Those who remained firmly Pagan, including the Anglo-Saxons who are my own paternal progenitors, were incessantly condemned by the church for allowing the marriage of cousins. With enough time, nearly all of Europe would be christianized, and their old nobilities were squandered out of existence as well, being replaced by constantly feuding christian families within decentralized petty kingdoms, facing endless war against each other and foreigners alike. With the old Pagan dynasties that once provided European security gone, the vulnerable peasants submitted themselves under local warlords, in exchange for protection within their castles. This chaotic christian feudal society is inevitably more vulnerable and weak in the face of any large foreign attack, let alone centuries of raids and invasions from islamists and mongols. All of the ancient tribal dynasties of Europe were extinguished within a couple generations of their christianization.

So the tribal family had been destroyed, and replaced with the smaller, weaker, more disconnected nuclear family. What reigned over and maintained this system was the church. No longer was authority within the blood as it had been since time immemorial, it was now within a nebulous, rapacious abomination of an institution, governed by a man made creed, not so very different then what rules over us today. The church did not have to pay any taxes, and much of the money of the population went directly to the church. The church also had the ability to acquire land, whereas much of the population that the church had subjugated, even many of the nobles, could not do this. This mutilation of our ancient tribal system had laid the groundwork firmly for individualism and liberalism one thousand

years before any of those terms came into existence. When banking and large scale mercantilism emerged in Europe late in the middle ages, it was able to do so without having to confront a robust and ingrained aristocratic tribal order. It was thus a natural development for the nuclear family to be replaced by the atomized, alienated individual, like we are seeing today under liberal capitalism.

By far one of the most disturbing things which christianity has done to our people, is the warping and mutilating of our very concept of nobility, the destruction of any true idea of strength itself, to the point where most Europeans cannot even conceive of what it is. The average European, even among the right wing, has a christian and nihilistic concept of nobility as meaning essentially to let people walk all over you and disrespect you, to always put the interests of the weak and malicious above your own, and to never do anything that disrupts the stagnant leftist christian order around you. Their christian idea of nobility is simply to be a stupid and harmless slave. This is because we are not taught any of the writings of our own blood, but are instead taught liberal dogmatism.

Those few who see the flaws of this flee to what came immediately before it, and they find the poison of christianity patiently waiting. So they take this poison, and adopt what is merely a primitive version of the leftism that now afflicts us. Consequently we gain no power, as when we do recognize our enemies and try to escape their grasp, we merely stumble about in a dark pit that they have built for us, as we are too scared to climb into the light, out of the pit of christianity, because we have been taught that the light which is our own blood is evil and harmful, and that this light is actually our enemy.

The affliction of despising one's own ancestors, so common among leftists and christians, is nothing new. It comes from christianity, which taught us that all of our ancestors were worshippers of literal demons from hell. That sentiment makes our own blood at best something to be regarded with suspicion, but more likely it portrays our own blood as abject evil. Not to mention the doctrine of "original sin" (which doubles down on this hideous pretension), or the fact that timeless offerings to ancestral spirits were banned on pain of death and replaced with the worship of a fictional jewish man.

On a personal note, that is one of many things that is extremely disgusting and disturbing about christian theology. The idea of a powerful god is not distasteful in itself – but what is repulsive is the idea that this supreme god is ultimately just some guy. Some jewish guy, with a face and limbs and a body. That is supposedly what created the entire universe, and what everyone should worship for eternity. Some jew.

Could there be any proposition more hideously disgusting than that? Not only that he created all things, but that he is literally in all things? Rape? Yeah, "god" the jewish guy. He's in there. Pedophilia? He is there too, the whole time. I don't think the average christian takes the time to ponder the fact that if Christ is in all, then he is indeed in everything, and nothing is off limits, and consequently nothing is sacred or profane anymore. Do you christians really like having your imaginary friend watching you at all times? And I do mean *all* times? Including when you are doing things that you do not show to anyone else? Do you like believing that this jewish man is silently watching you at every single moment while you masturbate? Is there any thought that is more disturbing than this?

Moreover, is there any greater form of cuckoldry than christianity ? We all know the term "chrislcuck" gets used a lot, but I think it is for a legitimate reason, even if Pagans do not fully comprehend it and only use the term intuitively. If you are a white man and you follow the orthodox form of christianity, you not only accept a foreign god, but you accept and worship a mere foreign man as your god. Not just any foreign man, but a jew. Just some jewish guy. You accept that the one you will

ceaselessly worship for eternity is a jewish guy, and that all of your ancestors, all of history, was merely created by a jew, for his jewish purposes alone. You also accept that this world has no purpose or meaning at all, outside of it being a mere inconvenience in the way of you worshipping a dead jew after you die.

All of your family, friends, experiences, progenitors, victories and defeats, all are nothing other than petty functionaries to you, which serve to push you closer to achieving that even keel of forever doing nothing other than worshipping a jew. What you follow is nihilistic cuckoldry, and it is all because of a combination of fear and ignorance that you are too weak to overcome. I do not think that the majority of christians are guilty of this, however, because they do not even study their own scriptures or think deeply about their doctrines. It is many young right wing christians who are guilty, as they devotedly study their doctrines, and advocate their own beliefs against Nietzscheans and Pagans.

Our intellect too was dumbed down and insulted. The new “god” himself as a concept violated basic laws of observable reality, and so we ourselves consequently forgot how reality functions. This condition remains with us today more than ever. Our people do not even know how reality works, because we are so obsessed with an obscene concept of universal freedom, and liberal equalitarianism, these things stemming from the christian obsession with libertarian free will, and from the abominable imago dei concept. Not only were our minds insulted, no. They were tortured, mangled, and desecrated. The christian falsehood of hell – preached by jesus and the priests, brought into existence an entirely new concept which had never been seen before. The idea of a place which is purely pain, and only pain, the idea that this is the place where the majority of humans end up, not just in pain, but in unimaginable horror.

How did the new “god” reward us? After we had all converted to his ways to worship him? Well, when we were not being eradicated or barely holding the line on battlefields against hordes of africans, arabs, mongols, and turks, and when we were not starving to death or dying in the millions from a multitude of diseases, we were being tormented in a new way, more cruel than all of those I have listed above – that is, tortured within the mind, with incomprehensible, indescribable horror and fear. The closest thing in this universe to a monstrous Lovecraftian entity that actually exists, is christianity. Has any more despicable horror ever been brought forth into this realm at all? I struggle to think of something that could rival it. Communism reigned for less then one hundred years, and the majority of it’s executions were at least open and honest, and did not involve any concept of an eternally torturous afterlife. Yet once we realize the truth, that communism is the offspring of christianity, we can attribute all of it’s terror to the correct source, and we can see that communism and christianity are of the same material. There is nothing that exceeds christianity in hideousness. It is the utter opposite of everything that it claims to be.

I am not of the opinion that suffering should be eliminated entirely, but I do think that such absurd and obscene heights of torture are not suitable for us. Yes, suffering has it’s place. Even severe suffering does. But this is bordering on simple eradication. Think of the abject mental terror, the senseless and lifelong horror, the unrelenting and ceaseless fear that our people have been put through, because of christianity. Think of a child, or a helpless woman during the worst of those dark ages. Contemplate what was done to them externally with famine, war, rape, and also within their minds at the monasteries and nunneries, through the fear of hell, if you can. Then realize that these instances occurred in the millions and millions. Why? Because of despicable oriental idealism, because of christianity. Such abominable

psychological torment did not exist before christianity . Because none of our ancestors could dream up such a concept.

Of course, there were myths of the afterlife, but these were myths, and not violently enforced dogma, or even thoroughly systemized at all. It could only have been conceived in the jewish mind, and forcefully implanted into the European mind. Our very confidence in ourselves was overturned. Our lives were infected with madness, submissiveness, and degeneracy.

The truth is that only a facile peasant could ever be comfortable with such a hideous concept. The double-digit IQ right wing christian cannot comprehend any of the superior alternatives, whether it is metempsychosis, *amor fati*, or Darwinian evolution, each of these are far too much to mentally handle for any vulgar, boorish simpleton of our times. The result is that the grovelling and insensitive churl simply clings to christianity, and thinks everyone else should do the same, even if it means inflicting horrendous torture upon his own people in their millions. The devoted right wing christian stupidly chooses his own cheap, slovenly cult of semitic solipsism and servile ignobility. Christianity is repulsive, vulgar, insatiable, and mongrelised, and so it is the most sorry and unfortunate of our people who end up clinging devotedly to it, because they are comforted by the distasteful qualities that they find within it, qualities that are similitudinous to their own.

Of course, war is unavoidable and necessary, and it had always happened before. The difference is that wars had become incessant in the dark ages, and we were very often incapable of victory. Also incessant, was disease. “But that is a natural phenomenon of nature and has nothing to do with christianity!” Oh, but it does. Interesting how you suddenly favour naturalistic causal factors instead of libertarian free will. There is indeed a causal factor here – and that factor is christianity. Christian moralism stupidly taught us that hygiene supposedly is of little importance. It did not preach against absurd practices of ritual washing and shaving from head to toe, no. Jesus himself scorned the simple act of washing ones hands before eating. Thanks to how stupid this and the rest of the teachings of the new testament were, the church which gained control of Europe had little interest in and paid no attention to anything relating to sanitation, and health naturally declined in both countryside and city. Thanks to a combination of many wars, often between christians, as well as the wider population being driven into ignorance, the old aqueduct systems fell into disrepair. Instead of being repaired, the christian populace often destroyed them further, selling the stones for monetary gain. The result of the cutting of the aqueducts was that massive swathes of the formerly fertile European countryside were flooded, and replaced with disease infested swamps. Add to this new terrain the general loss of basic sanitary practices and hygienic knowledge, and we see how christianity did in fact directly contribute to the constant pandemics of the dark ages.

If anyone, or any collective does not understand reality itself, they will not be able to act effectively within reality. The Germans, powerful as they were, simply failed to defend Europe during the dark ages. They failed. They were defeated. At a task which the Pagan Greeks and Romans had always succeeded. When Hannibal stormed through Europe he did not last long, and Rome then annihilated Carthage. When Xerxes assaulted Greece his armies were likewise quickly obliterated, and eventually Alexander crushed the entirety of Persia. There are many other cases I could list. The Pagans not only defended their borders, but assaulted the borders of our enemies, and settled their lands. The christian armies of Europe simply failed. Nowhere was safe for Europeans anymore. But the moors? The mongols? The arabs and turks? Well, they established territories and prosperous kingdoms deep within the European continent, and in many cases completely removed Europeans from the areas that they had

overtaken. The Islamic slave trade was prevalent even in places like Finland. The jews? Well, the christianized leaders of Europe, enacting their most wise christian virtues, now allowed the jews to freely charge interest to Europeans, whilst christians were forbidden to do the same against the jews. This braindead and moronic form of moralism is causing the destruction of our people. "Oh we can't be violent, that is what the left does!" "Let them be the powerful ones, we are meek and we shall inherit the earth!"

There is nothing inherently left wing about being violent or powerful, contrary to what many believe. One does not magically become a leftist when they achieve victory instead of defeat. There is nothing noble about being a pathetic and cowardly loser who lets people walk all over you because you are "above" them and refuse to use forceful methods to win. That kind of cowardice is in fact the opposite of nobility. What is truly inherently left wing, is the unfalsifiable faith in worthless liberal values that christians have. The following are quotes from *The Antichrist* of Friedrich Nietzsche which illustrate christianity with perfect clarity.

When the centre of gravity of life is placed, not in life itself, but in "the beyond"--in nothingness--then one has taken away its centre of gravity altogether. The vast lie of personal immortality destroys all reason, all natural instinct--henceforth, everything in the instincts that is beneficial, that fosters life and that safeguards the future is a cause of suspicion. So to live that life no longer has any meaning: this is now the "meaning" of life. . . . Why be public-spirited? Why take any pride in descent and forefathers? Why labour together, trust one another, or concern one's self about the common welfare, and try to serve it? . . . Merely so many "temptations," so many strayings from the "straight path."--"One thing only is necessary". . . That every man, because he has an "immortal soul," is as good as every other man; that in an infinite universe of things the "salvation" of every individual may lay claim to eternal importance; that insignificant bigots and the three-fourths insane may assume that the laws of nature are constantly suspended in their behalf--it is impossible to lavish too much contempt upon such a magnification of every sort of selfishness to infinity, to insolence. And yet Christianity has to thank precisely this miserable flattery of personal vanity for its triumph--it was thus that it lured all the botched, the dissatisfied, the fallen upon evil days, the whole refuse and off-scouring of humanity to its side. The "salvation of the soul"--in plain English: "the world revolves around me." . . . The poisonous doctrine, "equal rights for all," has been propagated as a Christian principle: out of the secret nooks and crannies of bad instinct Christianity has waged a deadly war upon all feelings of reverence and distance between man and man, which is to say, upon the first prerequisite to every step upward, to every development of civilization--out of the resentment of the masses it has forged its chief weapons against us, against everything noble, joyous and high spirited on earth, against our happiness on earth . . . To allow "immortality" to every Peter and Paul was the greatest, the most vicious outrage upon noble humanity ever perpetrated.--And let us not underestimate the fatal influence that Christianity has had, even upon politics! Nowadays no one has courage any more for special rights, for the right of dominion, for feelings of honourable pride in himself and his equals--for the pathos of distance. . . . Our politics is sick with this lack of courage!--The aristocratic attitude of mind has been undermined by the lie of the equality of souls; and if belief in the "privileges of the majority" makes and will continue to make revolution--it is Christianity, let us not doubt, and Christian valuations, which convert every revolution into a carnival of blood and crime! Christianity is a revolt of all creatures that creep on the ground against everything that is lofty: the gospel of the "lowly" lowers . . .

--I have been understood. At the opening of the Bible there is the whole psychology of the priest.--The priest knows of only one great danger: that is science--the sound comprehension of cause and effect.

But science flourishes, on the whole, only under favourable conditions--a man must have time, he must have an overflowing intellect, in order to "know." . . . "Therefore, man must be made unhappy,"--this has been, in all ages, the logic of the priest.--It is easy to see just what, by this logic, was the first thing to come into the world :--"sin." . . . The concept of guilt and punishment, the whole "moral order of the world," was set up against science--against the deliverance of man from priests. . . . Man must not look outward; he must look inward. He must not look at things shrewdly and cautiously, to learn about them; he must not look at all; he must suffer . . . And he must suffer so much that he is always in need of the priest.--Away with physicians! What is needed is a Saviour.--The concept of guilt and punishment, including the doctrines of "grace," of "salvation," of "forgiveness"--lies through and through, and absolutely without psychological reality--were devised to destroy man's sense of causality: they are an attack upon the concept of cause and effect!--And not an attack with the fist, with the knife, with honesty in hate and love! On the contrary, one inspired by the most cowardly, the most crafty, the most ignoble of instincts! An attack of priests! An attack of parasites! The vampirism of pale, subterranean leeches! . . . When the natural consequences of an act are no longer "natural," but are regarded as produced by the ghostly creations of superstition--by "God," by "spirits," by "souls"--and reckoned as merely "moral" consequences, as rewards, as punishments, as hints, as lessons, then the whole ground-work of knowledge is destroyed--then the greatest of crimes against humanity has been perpetrated.--I repeat that sin, man's self-desecration par excellence, was invented in order to make science, culture, and every elevation and ennobling of man impossible; the priest rules through the invention of sin.—

“But muh leftists said trust the science, therefore science is bad, and jesus good! Waaaaaaaah!”

Christians do not understand the ancient and pure Latin phrase of *Acta Non Verba*. If they did, they might realize that it does not matter what people say. Words are entirely worthless, if they are not backed up by the actions of those who speak them. Just because some jew says he is a divine messiah, that does not make it so. Likewise just because a leftist labels himself with the title of “science”, does not mean that they have a monopoly on clear and rational thinking. If we examine them, and find their words to be false, then their words do not matter. Their actions are what do matter. If a leftist claims to be rational, but then in the same breath they claim that there are no inherent differences between races, then they are simply not rational, because their actions betray their words. It is that simple. *Acta Non Verba*. Since right wing christians think every phenomenon is the result of libertarian free will or divine intervention instead of nature, they lose all understanding of how nature works, and consequentially all that they can do is flail around and screech like idiots. When christians adopt a scornful attitude against rationality, they only succeed in making themselves look like utter morons.

I’ve been there. You think you look righteous and profound, but in reality you just look like a complete dork. The only time in my life when I ever found myself consistently losing arguments, and frequently getting outwitted in debates, was when I was a christian. Because when you are a christian, you can produce no argument at all that isn’t “I feel like christianity is real, therefore it is.” It’s moronic.

Right wing christians implicitly give leftists a monopoly on cleverness and clarity, as well as natural behaviours that increase power like violence and sex. The only thing christians manage to ultimately retain are their poisonous and idiotic egalitarian principles which spawned and maintained leftism in the first place.

Let's check back in on the christian capital of the world, Alexandria. What had happened to them after they had finally purged the city of any European Pagan presence? Did their precious triune "god" favour them? Well, a colossal outbreak of the black plague, known as the plague of Justinian, reached that city quickly, and a gigantic amount of people died, 20% of them at the low estimate, though possibly up to 60%. The Justinian plague began in Egypt, and afflicted Justinian's empire to a strong degree. After this had subsided, we saw the rise of the arabs.

The reason that Europeans could not firmly check arab expansion was because of the changes that christianity had brought about. Since the church had become the dominant institution within Europe, it had engaged in a very severe drain on the economic resources of Europe. The cult of the orthodox faction was administered by a vast bureaucracy, which was nothing like the aristocratic Pagan hierarchy of old. The officials of the church were far more numerous and more highly paid than those of the state, and the result was that a shocking amount of Europe's wealth simply went to maintaining the parasites of the church bureaucracy, who would use the funds only to continue their work of spreading and enforcing christianity, which inevitably promotes pacifism and anti-natalism, as I clearly demonstrated. A sickening negative feedback loop had been created, and the fact that our race was not completely destroyed because of it is nearly miraculous. Whole cities were completely wiped out across Europe, and our entire continent itself was severely depopulated. Even Constantinople, the capital of christendom, nearly perished.

The origins of Islam are just as obscure as those of christianity, but there is hardly a notable difference between them, other than the fact that islam has proved itself to be far more cohesive and tenacious than christianity, and it also is more honest about its intentions. For some odd reason, those fervent and righteous Alexandrian christians were not so zealous about fighting an arabic army as they had been when they were fighting against an unarmed aristocratic girl. The city was quickly taken by islamic forces, and the majority of the Alexandrians converted to islam. Not only did the inhabitants of Alexandria convert, but within a century or two all of the areas of Africa and the middle east which spawned and grew christianity had converted too, often being settled by arabs. Not only did the arabs conquer formerly Indo-European ground in Asia and north Africa, but they conquered gigantic portions of Europe as well. Practically all of Spain, some of France, Sicily and other parts of Italy, all of Greece, the Balkans, all at various times ended up being dominated by arabs and africans, and not just for a handful of years either, but sometimes for many decades or even centuries. This was unprecedented. In the east, the mongols conquered enormous swathes of our territory as well. Of course, we did fight back, enough to keep them from taking all of our territory, and we did have the crusades, though these were not half as impressive as what was achieved in numerous instances during Pagan times. Who were some of the new christian heroes that the Europeans were instructed to emulate, in place of the old Pagan "demonic" ones?

There was no shortage of saints whose deeds were deemed worthy of eternal praise. In addition to the many "righteous" ones who I have listed so far, I will list some others that are still more "holy".

"Saint" Simon Stylites, in his devotion to "god", climbed to the top of an old pillar (one that was doubtless constructed in better times but left to abandonment by christians), and there lived his life, never leaving, through many summers and winters. He would pray in many postures on top of the pillar, and a favourite activity of his involved bending his frail body so severely that his head met with his feet, repeating this motion for many hundreds of repetitions at a time. He eventually died atop the pillar, and was canonized, still being venerated to this day in western and byzantine christianity, and he spawned a whole movement during his time of imitators who would also "live" by rotting on top of pillars and praising a jewish corpse. His story well summarizes the whole situation of christianity, a warped and insane freak performing sickly and meaningless gestures while mumbling nonsense atop the ruins of superior antiquity.

Baradates, a Syrian, and advisor of the byzantine emperor Leo, lived in a wooden box that was too small for him to lie down in, causing him to only be able to crouch, and then subsequently lived in a leather sack which had only a single small hole for him to breath through. He was canonized by the church. “Saint” Theodorus, alternated between two cages during his monastic life, one of iron during the summer, and one of wood for the winter, both exposed to the weather. He also wore an outfit of iron, which naturally would be numbingly cold in the winter, and blisteringly hot during the summer.

At one point during the dark ages, an entire hospital had to be founded near Jerusalem to provide shelter for all of the helpless wandering monks there who had completely lost their sanity. There were simply too many of them, as this phenomenon was being systematically promoted to people by the authorities all across our lands. To my shame, these were not just easterners, and our own people were just as susceptible to the disease. The Englishman called “saint” Godric of Finchale ate rotten food, as well as wheat mixed with ashes, and whatever nuts, herbs, and wild honey he could scavenge from the forest. During the freezing cold midwinter he prayed while sitting in a flowing river, and then continued his prayers with his starved body cramped in a barrel placed into the earth. Years ago when I was a catechumen in the church, one of my very favourites was “saint” Clodoald of Paris. A Frankish prince, he disgraced his nobility when he, to the disgust of his family, cut off his hair (this was considered akin to mutilation by Germanic aristocrats), and then retreated to the outskirts of Paris where he lived the life of a mystic, spending his time in prayer. The local peasantry very frequently consulted him for healing and advice, too much for his liking, so he moved his hut to an even more isolated location and continued his “heroic” deeds of torturing himself and talking to his imaginary friend. What a touching story. He also constructed a church in honour of Martin of Tours, the same Martin who went on a rampage destroying Pagan temples in Gaul with his mob of christian subhumans back during the reign of Theodosius. If this is the ideal behaviour that was being promoted to us, could anyone be surprised that we were so weak during these times?

“But the northern Europeans willfully converted, it is what we chose!”

Wrong. The only Germans who willingly converted were the ones who went over to heretical arianism, and scorned the “true” trinitarian “god”. The process of converting the Germans over to the cult of the orthodox faction was much the same as what was used on the Greeks and Romans. Revolutions begin from the top down, and not the bottom up, as modern people always assume. The Franks? Well, king Clovis was a Pagan, but had a christian wife. Wow! Some hypocritical christian girl getting willfully bedded over and over again by a Pagan man while the cuckolded church does nothing to stop her? How surprising! We certainly have not seen this scenario countless times already. We cannot blame christian girls for wanting us so badly though, as the christian men are commonly far too impotent and unmanly to ever satisfy their healthy desires, since being virile and being christian are mutually exclusive terms. Clovis seemed to seek the financial gains which could be acquired by heeding to the church. He converted to christianity under the influence of his wife. From then on, christianity was disseminated onto the rest of the Franks from the top down. This is the most peaceful example of the conversions of the Germanic peoples. You can basically repeat a more violent form of this formula for many of the Germans. In the case of the Franks, we must also consider the fact that they had heavily and comfortably mixed with the Gallo-Roman locals of Gaul, who had already been forcibly christianized long ago, and most of the other German pagans did not intermix so heavily. The formula is this – a weak or rapacious king converts because of either stupidity or desire for cordial relations with the church or a neighbouring state that was already christianized. Once the bishops get their tendrils into the local hierarchy, the cult is forced onto the rest of the populace through top down power, and banning of the old ways on pain of death.

The Franks effectively acted as the militant hordes of the bishops who would spread the church throughout Europe. Were I to write a more comprehensive history of this period, this work would be twice as long as it already is.

In England, the Anglo-Saxons managed to firmly and severely check the horrible cult. The Anglo-Saxons put a stop to christianity for long time, with the lands of Britannia that became England being made Pagan once again, through about two centuries. My direct paternal line originates here, among the Anglians. The Anglo-Saxons at first were invited by the Romano-Britons to defend their borders which they themselves could not. The contemporary christian monk and “saint” Gildas has this to say of the Anglo-Saxons during that event:

At that time all members of the assembly, along with the proud tyrant, are blinded; such is the protection they find for their country (it was, in fact, its destruction) that those wild Saxons, of accursed name, hated by God and men, should be admitted into the island, like wolves into folds, in order to repel the northern nations. Nothing more hurtful, certainly, nothing more bitter, happened to the island than this. What utter depth of darkness of soul! What hopeless and cruel dullness of mind! The men whom, when absent, they feared more than death, were invited by them of their own accord, so to say, under the cover of one roof: Foolish princes of Zoan, as is said, giving unwise counsel to Pharaoh.

It seems that the Anglo-Saxons launched an open invasion not long after this, which Gildas also describes.

For the fire of righteous vengeance, caused by former crimes, blazed from sea to sea, heaped up by the eastern band of impious men; and as it devastated all the neighbouring cities and lands, did not cease after it had been kindled, until it burnt nearly the whole surface of the island, and licked the western ocean with its red and savage tongue. In this assault, which might be compared to the Assyrian attack upon Judaea of old...

In this way were all the settlements brought low with the frequent shocks of the battering rams; the inhabitants, along with the bishops of the church, both priests and people, whilst swords gleamed on every side and flames crackled, were together mown down to the ground, and, sad sight! there were seen in the midst of streets, the bottom stones of towers with tall beam cast down, and of high walls, sacred altars, fragments of bodies covered with clots, as if coagulated, of red blood, in confusion as in a kind of horrible wine press: there was no sepulture of any kind save the ruins of houses, or the entrails of wild beasts and birds in the open, I say it with reverence to their holy souls (if in fact there were many to be found holy), that would be carried by holy angels to the heights of heaven.

As a result of this bloodstorm, christianity was effectively eliminated from the land, and the defeated Romano-Briton locals abandoned christ. The Anglo-Saxons are singular, as their invasion of Britain seems to be the only instance in history where christianity was defeated and purged from a large state by Pagans. The Anglo-Saxons were one of the least enthusiastic of all the Germans regarding the church, and the bishops had to come up with very subtle ways to spread their falsehoods to us. The church knew how top down power works, and they were fully aware that the rulers must first be targeted before the rest of the population, if they wanted any firm grounding within an area. That is how they obtained Greece and Rome. Pope Gregory initiated the process in the late 590s, by dispatching a mission led by a monk called Augustine to Kent. The Anglo-Saxon king of that realm had married a Frankish woman who was a christian. Yet another example of this phenomenon, more accurate than clockwork. It seems the only miracle christians can perform successfully is allowing their women to get bedded by Pagan men without fail every single time. The weak king of Kent, probably seeking gain from the Franks or from the church, converted, and the monk Augustine went about his operations in canterbury. From here onwards, the disease gradually spread throughout England. There exists an entire guidebook from this time

detailing the churches instructions for converting the Anglo-Saxons, and we see how they had to trick people into it by slightly altering Pagan practices and placing a jewish label on them. Instead of letting us sacrifice animals to the gods, they made us slaughter animals and praise jewish “god” before a feast. They altered our mythologies, so that the gods were merely mortal men who descended from jews. Old Pagan festivals were given new christian names by the church, et cetera. They obviously could not present an honest version of things. Now with government backing, the bishops could also build their churches over Pagan sanctuaries. Violent and forceful means still had to be used, despite all of the church subtlety. There are several accounts of the helpless babies of Pagan families being stolen by the church and baptized, naturally the Pagan parents would resist such despicable behaviour and violence occurred. Parts of England which favoured the church also had more funds for their armies, and with this advantage they did march against Anglo-Saxon areas which remained Pagan, and forceful mass conversions were carried out. Paganism seems to have lasted in some form for a very long time in England, as laws prohibiting it continued to be issued for many centuries.

Within more sequestered areas of Europe which did not have a lot of contact with the church previously, the subtle methods were tried, but did not work, so blatant force had to be used. The Saxons of Germany, as well as the Frisians, suffered immensely from this. The Franks, acting as the hordes of eastern darkness, had the full financial backing of the church and waged open war, committing outright genocide against the Saxons and Frisians, using torture and mass slaughter to convert their victims. The Franks also plundered the Pagan temples in the area of their gold and silver. “Saint” Boniface, while under the watchful protection of a Frankish garrison, heroically wielded his axe not against warriors in battle, but against a tree which could not fight back, this tree being a sacred oak of Thor to the Saxons. This is reminiscent of Jesus cursing a fig tree, because it did not have any fruit for him. The hatred of the natural world is simply engrained into the fabric of christianity. Even if the fig tree story was meant to be metaphorical, why did it have to be made in such a crude way? Couldn’t “god” have come up with a better idea than cursing a helpless tree?

Boniface himself was eventually cut down by a band of Frisian Pagans, who were rightfully enraged at his behaviour, as he did not only cut down the oak of Thor, but travelled throughout Germania desecrating any Pagan sanctuary he could find, Frisian or Saxon. In Scandinavia, the situation was much the same. Weak and rapacious rulers would convert, and attempt to force their subjects into the same error which they had fallen into. Here, the population was able to resist this very effectively for a long period of time, but they simply did not have the endless funds or top down power which the church could muster.

Other peoples, such as the Prussians, Livonians, and Wends, also had to be forcefully converted by the church, who used the usual christian methods of torture, invasion, bribery, and mass murder. There is truthfully no group of people throughout all of history who resisted christianity more than Europeans did, in proportion to how persistently and forcefully it was attempted to be foisted onto us. We are undoubtedly the group against whom the church has targeted it’s most strenuous efforts. We were not made better by the church either. We were made vulnerable, weakened in mind and body. That is just what christianity does. Here are the words of a medieval christian priest describing the Pagan Polabians, before they were violently forced into christianity .

So far as morals and hospitality were concerned, a more honorable or kindlier folk could not be found.

Men who sought to destroy our superior Pagan culture were canonized by the church whenever we were able to fight back and rightfully kill them. “Saint” Adalbert was killed by the Prussians after they tired of his incessant ramblings against their gods. One “saint” Bruno set out to Lithuania, and once he got there, like a true christian he went about smashing up any “false idols” he could find, as well as destroying sacred groves, until the Lithuanians finally beheaded him. In Laconia, the last Greco-Roman Pagans were forcefully converted, near the height of the middle ages.

Were I to write everything on this period, as I have said before, the work would be double the length, so it is necessary to stop here. The only thing left to discuss in this historical narrative is the renaissance, and modernity. I will end my discussion of the dark ages with some lines from a poem of that era known as *The Ruin*, from an unknown author who wrote in old English. It reveals to us that from the presence of the magnificent Roman ruins around them, and from half-remembered tales of old, our progenitors indeed knew that something wonderful had been lost, something of which now only silent ruins and whispered stories remained.

This masonry is wondrous; fates broke it, courtyard pavements were smashed; the work of giants is decaying. Roofs are fallen, ruinous towers, the frosty gate with frost on cement is ravaged, chipped roofs are torn, fallen, undermined by old age. The grasp of the earth possesses the mighty builders, perished and fallen, the hard grasp of earth, until a hundred generations of people have departed. Often this wall, lichen-grey and stained with red, experienced one reign after another, remained standing under storms; the high wide gate has collapsed.

Bright were the castle buildings, many the bathing-halls, high the abundance of gables, great the noise of the multitude, many a meadhall full of festivity, until Fate the mighty changed that. Far and wide the slain perished, days of pestilence came, death took all the brave men away; their places of war became deserted places, the city decayed. The rebuilders perished, the armies to earth. And so these buildings grow desolate, and this red-curved roof parts from its tiles of the ceiling-vault. The ruin has fallen to the ground broken into mounds, where at one time many a warrior, joyous and ornamented with gold-bright splendour, proud and flushed with wine shone in war-trappings; looked at treasure, at silver, at precious stones, at wealth, at prosperity, at jewellery, at this bright castle of a broad kingdom. The stone buildings stood, a stream threw up heat in wide surge; the wall enclosed all in its bright bosom, where the baths were, hot in the heart.

The dark ages began with the plague of Justinian, and so they ended with the black death of the fourteenth century, which afflicted even more people than any previous known outbreak. It was in the aftermath of this unprecedented wave of death, that Europe began to rapidly recover. After one thousand years, christianity in it's original form had lost it's potency. It was no longer revolutionary, and the promised kingdom of god never arrived. In northern Italy, there occurred a revival of Greco-Roman culture. This occurred at the exact same time when the final remnants of Constantine's byzantine empire were finally destroyed, after many centuries of entropy. On this topic, I must mention how retarded it is whenever christians say that they did not destroy Rome, because Byzantium continued to exist. As if the two are the same thing, or that they are to be considered remotely similar. Not to mention the fact that this Byzantine "empire" did almost nothing other than shrink and decay, ever steadily, unrelentingly, until it finally faded from existence. So no, christians, you really don't get to use the "Oh, but muh Byzantium!" excuse. Nice try though.

At Constantinople was the church of the holy apostles that Constantine constructed, which contained some relics of many of the very earliest of the saints, as well as the bodies of several of the very worst of the christians that I have discussed, Constantine, Constantius II, Jovian and his wife, Theodosius, Justinian, and Theodora. This church was demolished, and replaced with a mosque. The sarcophagus of emperor Julian was also at the church. Julian was actually first buried at Tarsus near the resting place of the devoted Pagan emperor Maximinus, but the sarcophagus of Julian was later moved to Constantinople because he was a close relative of Constantine. Julian's sarcophagus thankfully seems to have survived until this day. The new movement in northern Italy was centered on the city of Florence, a settlement that

was founded by Julius Caesar. Art was revived, and so was the philosophy of the Greeks and Romans, though christianity was residually present. An effort was made to hunt down and collect any surviving Greco-Roman literature, and Italians travelled across Europe to locate these documents, which were often hidden away in monasteries. Most of the oldest complete manuscripts of classical texts that we have are late medieval in date, and come from northern Italy, France, and Germany. Several texts, such as some of the writings of Tacitus, are known only from singular manuscripts. Most importantly, christianity was increasingly scorned, and the old superior ways preferred. The Florentine writer Machiavelli, who has now been made into a kind of personification of evil by both leftists and christians alike, was instrumental in the European reassertion of dominance over the world. He could see that the renaissance of his own time tended to be somewhat ostensible and superficial, and that people often only imitated the ancients in a superficial way, while retaining the weak values of christianity under the surface. I am inclined to agree with him, as I believe that the renaissance, while far superior to the dark ages, did not ultimately succeed in rooting out the poisonous idealism and weakness of christianity, even if christianity was checked by it for a great period of time. Machiavelli explains his thoughts on this at the beginning of his *Discourses*. I ask the reader to examine this closely, and to read it line by line, and to realize that we are much closer in time to Machiavelli than Machiavelli is to antiquity, and that his words apply to us today probably more so than they did to Europe during the renaissance.

When I consider how much honor is attributed to antiquity, and how many times, not to mention many other examples, a fragment of an antique statue has been bought at a great price in order to have it near to one, honoring his house, being able to have it imitated by those who delight in those arts, and how they then strive with all industry to present them in all their work: and when I see, on the other hand, the works of greatest virtu which Historians indicate have been accomplished by ancient Kingdoms and Republics, by Kings, Captains, Citizens, Lawgivers, and others who have worked themselves hard for their country, to be more readily admired than imitated, or rather so much neglected by everyone in every respect that no sign of that ancient virtu remains, I cannot otherwise than wonder and at the same time be sad: and so much more when I see in the civil differences that arise between Citizens, or in the maladies which men incur, they always have recourses to those judgments or to those remedies that have been judged or instituted by the ancients. For the civil laws are nothing else but the decisions given by the ancient Jurisconsults, which reduced to a system presently teach our Jurisconsults to judge, and also what is medicine if not the experience had by the ancient Doctors, and on which the present Doctors base their judgments? None the less in the instituting of Republics, in maintaining of States, in the governing of Kingdoms, in organizing an army and conducting a war, in giving judgment for Subjects, in expanding the Empire, there will not be found either Prince, or Republic, or Captain, or Citizen, who has recourse to the examples of the ancients. Which I am persuaded arises not so much from the weakness to which the present religion has brought the world, or from that evil which an ambitious indolence has created in many Christian Provinces and Cities, than from not having a real understanding of history, and from not drawing that real sense from its reading, or benefiting from the spirit which is contained in it. whence it arises that they who read take infinitely more pleasure in knowing the variety of incidents that are contained in them, without ever thinking of imitating them, believing the imitation not only difficult, but impossible: as if heaven, the sun, the elements, and men should have changed the order of their motions and power, from what they were anciently.

...that men were stronger in those days, which I believe to be attributable to the difference of education, founded upon the difference of their religion and ours. For, as our religion teaches us the truth and the true way of life, it causes us to attach less value to the honors and possessions of this world;

whilst the Pagans, esteeming those things as the highest good, were more energetic and ferocious in their actions. We may observe this also in most of their institutions, beginning with the magnificence of their sacrifices as compared with the humility of ours, which are gentle solemnities rather than magnificent ones, and have nothing of energy or ferocity in them, whilst in theirs there was no lack of pomp and show, to which was superadded the ferocious and bloody nature of the sacrifice by the slaughter of many animals, and the familiarity with this terrible sight assimilated the nature of men to their sacrificial ceremonies. Besides this, the Pagan religion deified only men who had achieved great glory, such as commanders of armies and chiefs of republics, whilst ours glorifies more the humble and contemplative men than the men of action. Our religion, moreover, places the supreme happiness in humility, lowliness, and a contempt for worldly objects, whilst the other, on the contrary, places the supreme good in grandeur of soul, strength of body, and all such other qualities as render men formidable; and if our religion claims of us fortitude of soul, it is more to enable us to suffer than to achieve great deeds.

These principles seem to me to have made men feeble, and caused them to become an easy prey to evil-minded men, who can control them more securely, seeing that the great body of men, for the sake of gaining Paradise, are more disposed to endure injuries than to avenge them. And although it would seem that the world has become effeminate and Heaven disarmed, yet this arises unquestionably from the baseness of men, who have interpreted our religion according to the promptings of indolence rather than those of virtue. For if we were to reflect that our religion permits us to exalt and defend our country, we should see that according to it we ought also to love and honor our country, and prepare ourselves so as to be capable of defending her.

Note that he himself does not outright reject christianity, but states that it should merely be reinterpreted in some way. I would content that such an overhaul is ultimately not possible, just as one could not make a poisonous plant healthy to consume without destroying it and replacing it with something healthy, something entirely different. The poison here are the teachings of the new testament itself, the teachings which maintain christianity. If one is familiar with the rest of Machiavelli's work, they will know that he essentially rejects christian morality entirely, and so he effectively rejected christianity in every way but name, as so many others during that era did. Many contend that the only reason he did not explicitly reject christianity was to maintain his own safety. In his work *The Prince*, his bible citations are incredibly sparse, and the few of them that do exist there belong only to the old testament and not the new, and even these few citations praise only martial vigour, and not any notion of christian "holiness". Throughout his work, he is known for paying only the most thin and faint lip-service towards christianity, as he seemingly is just careful and pragmatic enough not to incriminate himself by openly declaring his rejection of the church which still had incredible power during his day. Machiavelli is not at all to be considered as being similitudinous with an obstinate right wing christian of our own times.

I now return from my digression back to my narrative of the renaissance as a whole. The Reconquista in Spain was finally completed during these times, turkic expansion at last was checked at Vienna, and Europe began to rapidly cultivate strength and increase in power. The Greco-Roman classics were now widely read and taught amongst the nobility of Europe, and christian dogmatism lost it's stranglehold. Not that the priests didn't do their best to resist this, though. In Florence itself there occurred the so called "burning of the vanities", in which a fevered and seething priest enacted a mass

burning of priceless renaissance art and musical instruments. Not so very long after the burning of those “vanities”, the priest responsible for the sorry spectacle was himself accosted and burned.

There also occurred the reformation, which finally shattered any illusion of cohesiveness which the orthodox faction held previously. The new world was discovered, and we conquered it. These deeds were undoubtedly some of the greatest performed by our race since antiquity, but I would contend that these conquests did not in fact surpass antiquity, as the natives of the new world were truly no match for us by any means. Some may point to the puritans and conquistadors as examples of highly effective christian warriors. I agree that they were christian, but I also state that their actions were unquestionably more resemblant of antiquity than of christianity. What must also be realized is that the conquistadors were universally condemned by the church itself, and the puritans were practically a heretical and schismatic sect, who for the most part became classical deists within only a few generations of their arrival in the new world.

Near the end of the early modern era, the phenomenon of egalitarian liberal revolutions began to take place all over Europe. Superficially minded dolts among us now explain these as being caused by the renaissance itself, but these morons should not be listened to. If anything, these vulgar revolts were a violent and sudden reaction against the gains which we had made during the renaissance. The core principles of the current liberal ideology lie unquestionably within christianity, and the direct continuity between the two is simply an objective and demonstrable truth.

Our people had been mentally primed over the centuries for the imposition of liberalism, as the christian theological system mimics the liberal system of government that has been imposed onto us now. Within both of those systems, the most abominable and horrific degeneracy is allowed to go on unimpeded, no matter the consequences, all for the sake of a vain and disgusting notion of libertarian free will. Simply vile. Many christians are just capable enough to see the flaws of this system when it is something political, but when you point out that their “god” engages in the very same negligent, appalling, and repulsively obnoxious libertarianism, they suddenly become libertarians themselves, and defend their beloved libertarian free will, as if it is of any value at all.

One who is familiar with the rise of early socialism – Friederich Engels, et cetera, will know how firmly grounded that movement was within idealistic christianity, how steeped it’s writers were in christian ethics, and how it’s founders often saw themselves simply as neo-christians, which is indeed what they truthfully were.

Despite the renaissance, it is indeed true that so many aspects of christianity have remained pervasive in our times. We can inculcate christianity for the fact that the first experience millions of European males have had to go through immediately after our birth, is to be ripped away from the arms of our mothers, to then have the tips of our penises mutilated by some stranger. Good luck coping your way out of that one, you despicable christian imbeciles. You might be able to brush off Matthew 19:12 as not meaning what it blatantly says, but you cannot brush off the horror of infant genital mutilation, which you think is something that a divine being would command. No one can blame me for being so hateful towards you, when it is you who literally contend that we should worship a foreign fictional character who thinks that mutilating the tips of babies penises is a good thing, or ever was a good thing. How could any right winger, or any right minded person at all possibly still be christian after discovering the truth that I have revealed? The truth is that if you still obstinately cling to your cult, then your bible could tell you just about anything at all, no matter how horrible, and you would still find no problem with it. It could say that during the end times, jewbus himself and all the angels are going to take turns sodomizing every single one of your family members against their will over and over again, for one hundred years,

no, for one thousand, even one million years – and you would still cope, squirm, and cuck for your jewish corpse. After all, you still defend the church which has disproportionately and consistently produced countless priests that have literally raped and sodomized our own children, even ones of the very youngest ages, for many hundreds of years. You protect, love, and defend the most vile degenerates that have lived, people who actually deserve punishment, while you not only cause the vulnerable, helpless, and harmless to be subjected to horrors unimaginable, but you also hinder and thwart anyone with the strength or bravery to stand up against you, and your decadent cult of eastern perversion.

Just why are you christians so pathetic? Because you care about nothing other than your own comfort, and your decadent fantasy of eternal peace. You believe that the whole world revolves around you, and that anything goes as long as you keep cucking for your imaginary friend. You literally believe that the act of slicing up the tips of babies penises is something that is or was divinely sanctioned. How could I not hate you? How could I not use such harsh words when reprimanding you?

The noble, just, and heroic men of old were right to have you butchered and ripped to pieces in the arena. As emperor Julian said, is anyone not justified in pitying the more stupid among you, and despising the few of you who are intelligent?

The idols of equality, that is, of unrestrained social freedom, even if the result is degeneracy, with no real consequences, of the praising and liberation of women and the lower classes, of altruistic, suicidal moralism, of the indistinct blending of races, of the repression of healthful natural instinct, of the fragmentation and destruction of both family and race, all of these abominations, simply did not have any firm precedent in antiquity. They arise only from christianity. The sheer pervasiveness of the christian mindset in modernity cannot be understated. When it comes to our weakness and decadence, all roads really do lead to christianity. No one gets married anymore and women have far too much power and impunity? That is provably from the new testament. We don't fight back anymore, and when we are attacked and raped with impunity we are seen as a spineless joke by other races? That too is provably from the new testament. Our people know nothing of their own history and view their own ancestors on a narrow spectrum ranging from suspicion to sanctimonious contempt? This as well comes directly from the new testament.

Right wingers commonly cope by saying that the problems of modernity somehow magically appeared all at once during the renaissance, or at the dawn of the industrial revolution, or after world war two ended. Right wingers need to stop coping with these false beliefs.

The truth is that our modern problems started overwhelmingly with christianity, as I have clearly demonstrated. Just because fifteen people wrote books about rationalism over the past few hundred years, (books that almost none of the general population of our race ever read or were influenced by) that does not mean that they are somehow responsible for modernity. Descartes saying "*I think therefore I am*" didn't magically make our countries into leftist democracies overnight. Darwin writing *On the Origin of Species* did not cause us to instantaneously become impotent pacifists, who hate our own ancestors. Sorry right wing christians, but the truth is just a little bit more complex than what you would like to believe. No one can simply undo upwards of one thousand years of christian brainwashing over our people within a few hundred years. Tell me this christian fools – was it the writings of Gibbon, Hobbes, and Nietzsche which were legalistically imposed upon us, and absorbed almost universally by our race for fifteen-hundred years? Or was it the decadent slave morality of the new testament? The poisonous egalitarian morals of the new testament were deeply inculcated within the minds of our people since the dawn of the dark ages, despite the refreshing resurgence which occurred in the renaissance.

People do not seem to understand how many more of our people in this current age are familiar with the writings of the bible, as opposed to any other text in the world. The bible is a threat to no one at all, and least of all to the left. Christianity was never extinguished. It never even went away at all. Does the average leftist believe in the hierarchy and patriarchy of the Pagans? Or do they believe in the moral maxims of ‘judge not’, ‘give to the poor’, ‘turn the other cheek’, and ‘mind over matter’, all of which arise from the new testament alone? Most certainly the latter is the case. Christianity is what has caused the weak and decadent condition of the modern era. Not Paganism, not Nietzscheanism, and not Rationalism. Right wing autists and simpletons see the left today, they see how powerful it is, and they see some left wing people engaging in natural acts that we have always engaged in, and they then think:

‘ah ha! Power, violence, and sex, these are things that leftists have, so that means these things are left wing. Therefore, we should reject them. We must be meek and mild as Jesus. These leftists are the real tyrants, they are the ones who actually are violent, not us. We are above that!’

“But nobody literally thinks like that!!!!” Says my detractors.

Oh, but they do. Maybe not with the precisely specific words I have used, but it is certainly the line of reasoning that is dominant within the majority of the right wing today, and it is the reason why we never win. Something very peculiar has taken place. The right stands for nature, for rationality, for patriarchy, for racism, and for power, yet it is too cowardly to admit these things or to act on them, and so it cowers under the blanket of christianity, and it loses. The left on the other hand stands for idealism, for whining egalitarianism, for cringing moralism, and for decay, but it is not restrained by specious christian pretenses, and so it acts openly and confidently, and thus, finds itself winning.

Some particularly foolish right wing christians have had the audacity and stupidity to say that we live today in a “Pagan world”. This proposition is beyond absurd. The world today indeed has never been more christian. Not only is the true in the direct, literal sense, as christianity is now the most common religion on earth, and there are more christians in existence now than ever before, but it also is true in a more nuanced sense, as the degenerated form of moralism which christianity spawned into the world is equally as present among modern society even more so than the ostensible church itself. How many people have you known who pray to jesus and read the bible? How many people have you known that read Greco-Roman literature and pour libations of red wine to Mercury upon a stone altar in a sacred grove? How many people do you know that are able to recall stories of the bible or sayings of Jesus? And how many do you know who can tell stories from our own mythologies or can quote from classical literature? How many people do you know that have attended church during their lifetimes? Do you know anyone at all who can name the deities of any of the temples on the Tiber Island, or atop the Capitoline Hill?

Last year, I spoke to an elderly family member about my visit to Rome, and I mentioned how wonderful the Pantheon is. I told this individual that long ago it had been converted to a christian church, and do you know what this person did? The individual simply looked confused, and uncertain, and asked me if Italy used to be ISLAMIC before they were converted to christianity.

I literally had to explain the fact that Pagans once existed, because this person had no clue about our own history, and could not fathom the existence of anything other than abrahamism and liberalism.

This wasn't a young, ignorant person either, it was someone quite old, and of a normal level of intelligence. Our people cannot even comprehend the existence of a world that is not christian.

If you speak in opposition of 'judge not', if you challenge the idea of 'turn the other cheek', if you argue against 'mind over matter', people think you are mentally insane. Because the inherently christian mindset of toxic egalitarian moralism has never been stronger in this world then it is right now.

I often visit used book stores, to try and salvage whatever classical texts I can find for an affordable price. Each time I visit, out of the almost innumerable thousands of books in these stores, the number of classical works present are always countable on one hand. Crucial texts such as *The Iliad* and *The Aeneid* are nowhere to be found, and my own copies of these books were purchased online, because I could not find a single copy of either in any used bookstore. If any genre of literature qualifies as being obscure in these times, it is ancient Greco-Roman literature. But what is the situation in these stores regarding christian literature? Is it plentiful? Or has this "Pagan world" made it disappear?

Well, the shelves are not big enough to contain the overwhelming heaps of christian books which flood abundantly out of the rows and into tall piles on the floor. I do not even live in a fervently christian area either, yet here there are christian books of every kind in a quantity that is next to infinite. Classical Pagan books will only be found as a few needles in a haystack, one here, and one there, but no more than this. Each store has an entire section devoted solely to christian books, and these large spaces are not vast enough to contain the sheer quantity of christian literature that circulates unimpeded throughout our society. The reason for this is that the left is not threatened by christianity. Christianity is the biggest religion in the world, and the left faces no serious resistance from it anywhere. Because christianity itself is merely leftism in it's primitive form.

The truth is that a right winger who is primarily focused on the church instead of politics is effectively something approximating an inert substance. He is alike to a drifting nonentity, who's sole exertion is towards his own self-negation. The young, devout christian right wing male is a stagnant irrelevancy, a moot point, and a nonfactor within the social and political landscape. How can he be anything else, when all he does is play videogames, watch anime, fap to porn, pray, go to church, and repeat, all the while being told by other christians that jeebus will still accept him regardless of his pitiful state. He is totally and completely neutralized.

It is demonstrably true that feds have played a large role in the sudden upsurge of christianity within the right wing youth recently. This is because the feds are not stupid, and they are well aware of the fact that christianity, even in it's most traditional forms, is the most effective tool they have for their task of deradicalization and neutralization of the young, white, right wing youth – which is what they are actually in opposition of. They do not care about christianity. All of the examples of christian soldiers that right wingers point to were men who ignored the teachings of jesus, and were very often some of the least religious and most hated men by the church in their own societies. One of the most famous medieval crusaders of them all, William Marshall, an Anglo-Norman knight who fought Saladin, had engraved around his tomb the words '*I was a son of Mars*' in Latin. Yes christians, Mars. The actions of the conquistadors were utterly condemned by the church. Cotton Mather, a leading writer of the puritanical English pilgrims who conquered New England, wrote that illicit sexual activity was so common among them, that if all the stones of the world were piled up into a mountain so tall that it reached heaven, that this mountain would still not have enough stones to stone each sexual sinner among them to death. The reason our forefathers were so strong was because they sometimes found the strength to ignore the commands of the church which was imposed forcibly onto our race.

To anyone who would be so obstinate and foolish as to still insist that the world today is “Pagan”, I will present the following quotations. I will compare the words of christianity through the bible, and the words of Paganism through classical literature side by side, and the reader can judge for themselves which of the two beliefs is more in alignment with the ‘mind over matter’, ‘don’t judge’ liberal morality promoted to us by our modern weak society. Each christian writing I display will be followed by a Pagan reply, and I have indicated before each Pagan passage who the speaker is whenever it is applicable. Through this method, I will also show to any perennialist, esotericist types that christianity and Paganism are not in any way compatible, and that they are not merely two different expressions of the same belief. The truth is that they could not be any more different.

Then Jesus said to him, “Put your sword back into its place. For all who take the sword will perish by the sword.

-Matthew 26:52 (ESV)

(Achilles speaking) Come now and try, so that the rest may see what happens. Your blood will soon be flowing in a dark stream down my spear.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 1

Now the full number of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things that belonged to him was his own, but they had everything in common.

-Acts 4:32 (ESV)

(Odysseus speaking) You there, he said, sit still and wait for orders from your officers, who are better men than you, coward and weakling that you are, counting for nothing in battle or debate. We cannot all be kings here; and mob rule is a bad thing. Let there be one commander only, one King, set over us by Zeus the Son of Cronos of the Crooked Ways.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 2

To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though not being myself under the law) that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (not being outside the law of God but under the law of Christ) that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, that by all means I might save some.

-1 Corinthians 9:20-22 (ESV)

(Achilles speaking) I hate like the Gates of Hades the man who thinks one thing and says another.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 9

To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single, as I am.

-1 Corinthians 7:8 (ESV)

(Achilles speaking) And are the Atreidae the only men on earth who love their wives? Does not every decent and right minded man love and cherish his own woman, as I loved that girl, with all my heart, though she was captive of my spear?

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 9

Put on then, as God's chosen ones, holy and beloved, compassionate hearts, kindness, humility, meekness, and patience, bearing with one another and, if one has a complaint against another, forgiving each other; as the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive.

-Colossians 3:12-13 (ESV)

(Diomedes speaking) But my weapons have a better edge. One touch from them, and a man is dead, his wife has lacerated cheeks, and his children have no father; the earth turns red with his blood, and there he rots, with fewer girls than vultures at his side.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 11

Now may the Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times in every way. The Lord be with you all.

-2 Thessalonians 3:16 (ESV)

(Hector speaking) Let us pin our faith to the mandate of almighty Zeus, who governs all mankind and the gods as well. Fight for your country – that is the best and only omen.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 12

Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth. For you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God.

-Colossians 3:2-3 (ESV)

(Achilles speaking) With that in mind, I cannot interest myself in your programme, or in anything but blood and slaughter and the groans of dying men.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 19

I tell you this, brothers: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Behold! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed. For this perishable body must put on the imperishable, and this mortal body must put on immortality.

-1 Corinthians 15:50-53 (ESV)

(Apollo speaking) you would credit me with very little sense if I fought you for the sake of men, those wretched creatures who, like the leaves, flourish for a little while on the bounty of the earth and flaunt their brilliance, but in a moment droop and fade away.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 21 (Note: The christian passage from 1 Corinthians in this comparison enforces the leftist idea of mind over matter, and modern anthropocentrism. The Pagan passage promotes reality.)

This is evidence of the righteous judgment of God, that you may be considered worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are also suffering— since indeed God considers it just to repay with affliction those who afflict you, and to grant relief to you who are afflicted as well as to us, when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, inflicting vengeance on those who do not know God and on those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus. They will suffer the punishment of eternal destruction, away from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might, when he comes on that day to be glorified in his saints, and to be marveled at among all who have believed, because our testimony to you was believed.

-2 Thessalonians 1:5-10 (ESV)

The last of all of them to arrive was Admetus' son Eumelus. He was dragging his handsome chariot himself and driving his horses in front of him. When he saw this, the swift and excellent Achilles was sorry for the man. He stood up in the ring and made a suggestion: 'The best driver of the lot has come in last. Let us give him a prize, as is only fair. Make it the second, for of course Diomedes takes the first.

(Achilles speaking) Antilochus, if you really wish me to send for something extra from my hut and give it to Eumelus as a consolation prize, I will do that for you. I will give him the cuirass I took from Asteropaeus. It is made of bronze and plated with bright tin all over. It is a gift that he will value.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 23 (Note: The comparison I am trying to display here is that christianity, much like modern liberalism, is extremely harsh and unforgiving about utter nonsense, and forgiving during instances when forgiveness should be scorned. Paganism on the other hand is lighthearted and generous when it is appropriate, and harsh when the situation demands it. The complete opposite of christianity.)

Let no one say when he is tempted, "I am being tempted by God," for God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempts no one. But each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire.

-James 1:13-14 (ESV)

(Achilles speaking) We men are wretched things, and the gods, who have no cares themselves, have woven sorrow into the very pattern of our lives.

-Homer, The Iliad, Book 24 (Note: The passage from James enforces the idiotic leftist idol of libertarian free will. The Pagan passage is honest, and states the truth, which is that man cannot overpower fate.)

If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.

-Luke 14:26 (ESV)

(Odysseus speaking) ...since there is nothing nobler and more admirable than when two people who see eye to eye house as man and wife, confounding their enemies and delighting their friends, as they themselves know better than anyone.

-Homer, The Odyssey, Book 6

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.

-Matthew 5:9 (ESV)

(Odysseus speaking) What I always loved was a ship with oars, and fighting, and polished javelins and arrows – terrible things, which make other people shudder.

-Homer, The Odyssey, Book 14

And as they continued to ask him, he stood up and said to them, "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her."

-John 8:7 (ESV)

Finally, when the whole house had been set in order, they took the women out of the building, and herded them between the round-house and the great courtyard wall in a narrow space from which there

was no escape. Then Telemachus spoke. 'I swear I will not give a decent death', he said, 'to women who have heaped dishonour on my head and on my mother's, and slept with members of this gang.' With that he took a hawser which had seen service on a blue-bowed ship, made one end fast to a high column in the portico, threw the other over the round-house, and pulled it taut at such a level as would keep their feet from touching earth. And then, like doves or long-winged thrushes caught in a net across the thicket where they came to roost, and meeting death where they had only looked for sleep, the women held their heads out in a row, and a noose was cast round each one's neck to dispatch them in the most miserable way. For a little while their feet kicked out, but not for very long.

Next Melanthius was dragged out across the court and through the gate. There with a sharp knife they sliced his nose and ears off; they ripped away his privy parts as raw meat for the dogs, and in their fury they lopped off his hands and feet. Then, after washing their own hands and feet, they went back indoors to Odysseus and the business was finished.

-Homer, The Odyssey, Book 22

Jesus said to him, "If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."

-Matthew 19:21 (ESV)

Only a fool does favours for the base; you'd do as well to sow the grey salt sea. No crop of corn would come up so deep, no gratitude, no favours from the base. The scum are never sated. If you slip, just once, their former friendship melts away. But put a gentleman once in your debt, you have a friend for life; he won't forget.

-Theognis, Elegies

And Jesus called them to him and said to them, "You know that those who are considered rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you. But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all.

-Mark 10:42-44 (ESV)

(Chorus speaking) Never, better to die on your feet than live on your knees.

-Aeschylus, Agamemnon

To one who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also, and from one who takes away your cloak do not withhold your tunic either.

-Luke 6:29 (ESV)

Various opinions were expressed on both sides, and Cleon, the son of Cleaenetus, spoke again. It was he who was responsible for passing the original motion for putting the Mytilenians to death. He was remarkable among the Athenians for the violence of his character, and at this time he exercised far the greatest influence over the people. He spoke as follows: 'Personally I have had occasion often enough already to observe that a democracy is incapable of governing others, and I am all the more convinced of this when I see how you are now changing your minds about the Mytilenians. Because fear and conspiracy play no part in your daily relations with each other, you imagine that the same thing is true of your allies, and you fail to see that when you allow them to persuade you to make a mistaken decision and when you give way to your own feelings of compassion you are being guilty of a kind of weakness which is dangerous to you and which will not make them love you any more.'

-Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 3

You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven.

-Matthew 5:43-45 (ESV)

(Cleon speaking) As for compassion, it is proper to feel it in the case of people who are like ourselves and who will pity us in their turn, not in the case of those who, so far from having the same feelings towards us, must always and inevitably be our enemies.

-Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 3

Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. For by it the people of old received their commendation. By faith we understand that the universe was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things that are visible.

-Hebrews 11:1-3 (ESV)

(Athenians speaking) Hope, danger's comforter, may be indulged in by those who have abundant resources, if not without loss at all events without ruin; but its nature is to be extravagant, and those who go so far as to put their all upon the venture see it in its true colours only when they are ruined; but so long as the discovery would enable them to guard against it, it is never found wanting. Let not this be the case with you, who are weak and hang on a single turn of the scale; nor be like the vulgar, who, abandoning such security as human means may still afford, when visible hopes fail them in extremity, turn to the invisible, to prophecies and oracles, and other such inventions that delude men with hopes to their destruction.

-Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 5

Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God, for it is written, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord."

-Romans 12:19 (ESV)

(Gylippus speaking) ...let us go into battle with anger in our hearts; let us be convinced that in dealing with an adversary it is most just and lawful to claim the right to slake fury on the aggressor, and also that we shall have the greatest of all pleasures, which consists, according to the proverb, in taking vengeance on an enemy.

-Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 7

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

-Galatians 3:28 (ESV)

And as for the miserable publican, (miserable man that I also am, when I see the miseries and sufferings of those men who have deserved so well at my hands,) he handed them over as slaves to the Jews and Syrians, races themselves born to be slaves.

-Cicero, On the Consular Provinces

You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews.

-John 4:22 (ESV)

They hold it to be impious to make idols of perishable materials in the likeness of man: for them, the Most High and Eternal cannot be portrayed by human hands and will never pass away. For this reason they erect no images in their cities, still less in their temples. Their kings are not so flattered, the Roman emperors not so honored. However, their priests used to perform their chants to the flute and drums, crowned with ivy, and a golden vine was discovered in the Temple; and this has led some to imagine that the god thus worshipped was Prince Liber, the conqueror of the East. But the two cults are diametrically opposed. Liber founded a festive and happy cult: the Jewish belief is paradoxical and degraded.

-Tacitus, Histories

And so we have arrived at the end of the historical narrative. A tremendous problem within the right wing is that so many right wingers lack perspective. They see the modern world with all its problems, and in the corner they see waiting for them the quiet christian church with nice, harmless images of Jesus, superficially such a strong contrast to the wider world today. They do not know how our

ancestors thought or lived, and they do not know history either, and so they are drawn into the grasp of christianity.

Because of their ignorance, they fail to see the truth. The truth is that ultimately, over the past 1500 years since the accession of Justinian, even despite the positive changes in the renaissance, nothing has really changed. Liberalism, an updated form of christianity, has now replaced the old churches as the dominant power structure wherever Europeans dwell. We are still living firmly in the christian age, in which values that are contrary to the beliefs of our progenitors are legalistically enforced onto us by an amorphous bureaucracy which has replaced the patriarchal aristocratic Pagan families of old. The eastern power structure promotes egalitarian maxims, glorifies weakness, privileges adulterous women, suppresses natural masculine resistance, enforces escapism and denigration of the material world, enables degenerate scum while restraining the noble and unsullied, and lastly, it denies any differentiation between class, gender, and race. The current liberal structure and all of its adherents are merely being consistent and faithful to their christian origins, by taking christian values to their logical conclusions.

Leftists for the most part only disown christianity verbally because of the behaviour of a miniscule fringe group of christian right wingers who espouse values that are largely the opposite of the creed that they confess. It is a statistical fact that right wing christian nationalism arises almost completely amongst christians who have the very lowest church attendance rates, and that some of the most unequivocally and firmly right wing states in the union, Idaho, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and West Virginia, (which are also some of the most white), have incredibly low church attendance rates. Some are in fact so incredibly irreligious that they form a big part of what is known as the ‘unchurched belt’ today. So much for the “Oh, muh secularism is leftist” cope. The teeming masses of America that actually attend church are factually the ones who also vote in liberal policies overwhelmingly. This is because these christians actually try, at least to some degree, to follow the values of the new testament, whereas the right wing christians almost all merely confess Christ out of ignorance, because they cannot fathom anything other than christianity as a possible negation of leftism. They don’t see that one does not have to set foot in a church to espouse egalitarian christian moralism, nor do they see that most who do attend churches also support leftist moralism. In rural areas of America, where organized right wing radicalization has been attempted, it is known that the only firm and devoted opposition to radicalization in such places came from local christian pastors. This is not surprising, since we now know that christianity is the inculcator and guardian of leftism and weakness.

Another cope that I must obliterate now is the defence that is sometimes uttered by christian right wingers, which states some thing to the effect of “Oh, but without christianity, I’d be a degenerate leftist!” This usually thinly hides a blatant lie, as the right winger who says such often could not indulge in the supposedly “degenerate” behaviour he is speaking of (making love with girls) even if he tried to, due to his own poor looks or autism.

He states such a defence merely because he wants to give the impression that he is making some “virtuous” “choice” to be celibate and infertile. The reality is that his autistic adherence to christianity is the effect, not the cause, of his celibacy, which is involuntary. They say that they want to be celibate, yet their search history says otherwise.

Now, even if we did take the “But christianity made me into a right winger!” cope seriously, it still would not be the firm defence of christianity that right wingers think it is. If it is fully true, then it means that the person espousing it is not even a genuine and honest right winger, but is someone who needs to be threatened with severe punishment in order to be on our side. Far from giving a good defence of the effectiveness of their cult, these copers merely prove their own disingenuous and spineless nature,

when they themselves admit that they would not share any of our values at all if they were not being threatened with torture in order to do so.

“But I can still be a right winger and be christian!”

I suppose you can be a right winger, but what you can not be is an effective right winger, as long as you are christian. You can only ultimately be a defective right winger, when you bind yourself to the scriptures and to the church which have in the first place caused the problems which you claim you wish to solve. You cannot just fix such a trainwreck either. This was a disease from the start, as I have proven. Some diseases have no cures, and this contagion is one such example. Some of us were lucky enough to survive it, simply because our immune systems managed to fight it off. But for so many, the disease is far too insatiable, to the point where no attempt at a cure or stabilization is effective. The only medicine for such a virus is it's liquidation, and where it's liquidation is not possible, quarantine must be maintained until the infection eventually eats itself away.

Is there any spectacle in history that is more sorry than the church? Could there realistically be any more absurd, hypocritical and contemptible thing, any phenomenon more ridiculous and worthy of utter destruction? The church could not be more obnoxious, more disgraceful towards humanity, more incomprehensibly vile, in any reasonable, mathematical estimation. It speaks for itself! Born again virgins, tens of thousands of denominations, literal eunuchs and ugly husks teaching from the pulpit, malicious pedophiles reading jewish fables to our children while a wooden corpse is suspended upon the walls. Do I need to say more? Given that the situation is as bad as it is, I think that more is necessary. The prosperity gospel scamming millions of the poor out of their livelihoods, countless fake miracles with zero real ones, trendy youth pastors making a mockery of our race, insidious gaslighting to an unseen degree, and unfalsifiable statements more abundant than the number of christians themselves. Millions of our children horrifically raped, and still more christians who withhold punishment upon the priests that commit those atrocities, not only withholding punishment from pedophilic rapists, but loving them, and forgiving them. Why do they forgive them? Because they want to please a jewish cadaver. No mention of our history, of our race, or of our ancient values within the bible or the church. All that you will find in the bible and the church are 'love jeebus', 'judge not', and 'turn the other cheek'. Or in other words – shut up, suffer, and die.

For the tired, mentally battered, gentle old man of our people, who wears a shirt with an eagle and the American flag, and on Sundays attends his local church in Alabama, I can feel nothing other than pity and sorrow. Because this poor harmless fellow is not guilty, but is rather a victim of dark and sinister forces that he cannot comprehend.

But for you? That is, you young right wing christians who have now read the truth, and despite everything, are still too cowardly to snap out of your judaic trance? I can feel only a sense of irritated contempt, as though I have been betrayed. This work of mine will help to determine who is truly loyal to our race, and who on the other hand ultimately prioritizes their own facile sensations of comfort, and thusly clings onto christianity. Ignorance is what has afflicted us for so long, ignorance of the true origins of the rot that now afflicts us so severely.

I have eradicated this ignorance for any who read this. I have given perspective, and displayed the reality of history. If any right winger at this point still clings to christianity, perennialism, gnosticism, or any other of these vile cults which have nearly destroyed us, they are simply a coward. Within the following dialogue, I will fully demonstrate why that is.

III: King Minos

Participants in the discussion:

KING MINOS, the judge of the underworld

MOROSIS, a young white right wing christian man who has recently been killed in a leftist riot

CERBERUS, the guardian of the underworld (silent)

HYPNOS, the god of sleep (silent)

THANATOS, the god of death (silent)

A vast and gloomy yet serene cavernous chamber within the realm of Hades. There are cypress and poplar trees growing in stately groves dispersed throughout the darkened, foggy plain. The picturesque underworld grasses sway calmly and uncaringly, and a faint chthonic luminescence of aquamarine and purple seems to emanate throughout the area, illuminating various places and slowly travelling across the landscape in an unhurried way.

Morosis gazes at the landscape of Hades around him

Morosis: so, this must be heaven... I never thought that it would be so dark, and so much like the earth... but where is the saviour? And where are all the souls of the saved? The four beasts that surround the throne of god? And the throne itself? I can see none of what I was expecting, only these rolling grassy hills, with a few trees and patches of woodland here and there, all of it enshrouded by this mist.

Morosis wanders about and looks around for a moment, but finds nothing that he is looking for

Morosis: Perhaps it is the case that the catholics were right, and this is the purgatorial place that they speak of, or something like that. I suppose that it is true that I never did manage to overcome my various sinful habits before I died, though I tried to free myself from them many times. It is only just that god should keep me here temporarily, I suppose. This place is not so terrible however, I do at least feel free from the mental and bodily pain I felt while in my last moments back on earth. If this is indeed the realm

of purgatory, then there must be some other souls here. I will keep searching until I find someone, possibly someone who has been here longer than I have, who can explain to me in more detail what will happen to me.

Morosis wanders forth, and in a moment finds a stone path, clearly in the style of a Roman road, but the large dense stones themselves are vibrant with glinting, opalescent shades of red. Morosis follows this path for a time, before a lofty figure comes into view, faintly illuminated in the distance

Morosis: why, I think I do see a fine throne of stone in the distance there, and on the throne sits a powerful looking figure, perhaps it is the saviour! Though the light in this place is just too faint for me to clearly discern who that might be...

Morosis moves forward, ever closer to the figure in the distance

Morosis: Yes, I am beginning to discern his noble features more clearly to a certain degree, though I think I can also vaguely see some creature there beside him... perhaps it is a cherubim...

Morosis gets close enough to see clearly the sight before him. He stops, taken aback, and takes a moment to observe the king

Minos sits calmly upon his throne. Incredibly tall, he has the flawless and crisp features of a Hellenistic marble athletic statue. His eyes shine a pale and cold blue, his straight sable hair glimmers down to his shoulders, and his gracefully muscular torso is just as divine and austere as the rest of his features. The lower half of his body is a powerful serpent tail, it's purplish blue scales gently gleaming in the underworld lighting. Next to him, Cerberus, a three headed canine with a mane of vipers and the tail of a serpent. Relaxed, but clearly aware and ready to strike with force at any moment. Behind the pair, within view slightly off to the side, stands the imposing and lofty gates of Hades, constructed and sculpted of crimson porphyry stone

Morosis: Such an abomination! You are but a mere demon, a deception, sent only to test my faith in Christ! How dare you defy god in my presence!

Minos: Is it Christ you seek? Well, he is here, and soon, you may be able to meet him.

Morosis: I knew he is, because my faith is unbroken. Now, step aside demon, you have no power here. I am a servant of god alone.

Minos: I will not step aside, impudent slave. I have judged countless souls just like you, and I shall judge countless more. What reigns here are the powers of earth and darkness. Your judean pretender is more powerless now than you are yourself. Now, allow me to show you who holds authority in this realm.

Cerberus, eyes glowing orange with chthonic hate, lunges forth with strength and fury inconceivable to a mortal man. Cerberus proceeds to give Morosis a good thrashing with tooth and claw. During this, Morosis desperately performs the lord's prayer as best he can several times, but after this has no effect and the attack continues. Morosis ceases his prayers, and Cerberus consequently eases away. Morosis cautiously gets up, and faces Minos.

Morosis: if... if you say that Christ is indeed here, then why do you also say that he has no power? Just what is this place? Is this purgatory? Is this hell? Has my ceaseless lust in life brought me to this lamentable fate?

Minos: This is not any place invented by the judeans to frighten you. This is the realm of Hades. I am the judge here, and it is I that shall decide what your fate will be.

Morosis: But what of the saviour? Why have I been condemned?

Minos: You have not been condemned, at least, not yet. The pretender does not save you now, because he does not save anyone at any time. He does not hear your prayers, because he was but a mere deceiver in life. There is no christ who forgives sins, because there is no christ at all. You are here not because of what you call lust, rather it was because you put all of your focus on praying for forgiveness, loving your enemies, and playing video games, when you ought to have been learning martial prowess and mental resilience. Your incompetence and naivety caused you to be torn to pieces by that mob.

Morosis: You speak nothing more than blasphemy. It is you who is the deceiver! I know this is merely a test of faith, I simply know it, and none of your lies will ever convince me otherwise. God in his wisdom is allowing me to be presented with a challenge, and by my faith I will overcome it. If you think you are correct, then why don't you engage with me in a true argument, without you resorting to using that infernal beast to attack me. Just a debate. I, with my unbroken faith, and the help of the one true god, and you, with only your demonic lies. Your darkness will flee and dissipate before the light of Christ.

Minos: So it is an honest debate that you really desire? Well, I would be more than happy to oblige you. Just know that you are far from being the first one to try this method, and that you will be judged by me no matter what.

Morosis: I have known many that follow you and your kind, and they are but blind and mad men. They have willingly closed their eyes to the pure and simple truth of the gospel. This is primarily out of pride, I believe. Regarding the topic of pride, if you honestly think that you know better than god, then why do you provide absolutely no foundation for those that follow you at all? We have our scriptures, infallible and true, and you have nothing!

Minos: Do you think that just because you happen to have a foundation, that it is automatically a good foundation, simply due to the fact that it exists? Are you aware of the fact that your own faith has splintered into an uncountable number of denominations, and that it is nearly impossible to find two christians in this world who agree on every doctrine? Do you know that your scriptures do not even agree with each other, and that this fact proves that the argument for your church is false objectively? I am sure that I do not need to remind you that your behaviour never improved either, and that even after you converted, you continued to engage in the same old vices that you knew were not lawful within your newfound belief.

Morosis: I myself have never claimed to be perfect, or even to be good at all, and in the words of Paul, I am the chief of sinners. Despite this, I believe and know that it is the only good foundation, as I have seen in my own life and in the history of my race. As christ said, we shall know them by their fruits.

Minos: If you are not even good, then why should anyone listen to you? If your belief doesn't even improve people, but allows them to remain in a degenerate state, then it is of no value. You only seem to care about pascals wager, which you think will win you eternal paradise. And just what fruit are you talking about? Do you mean a rotten apple? Even that in reality would still be more palatable than what you preach. Since you adopted the jew your mind has been infested with doubt and fear, hideous tortures, and broken confidence. Have you no memory of your own life before you fully came to this depraved cult of the east? Do you not recall the unapologetic triumph, the joy, the lightheartedness you used to engage the world with? Your vices actually became even worse after you submitted to the jews. Do you have no knowledge of the undaunted and incalculable glory once exhibited by your race, before the plague of the east infected them? Moreover you are of north Germanic descent. That means that your ancestors only converted at most during the seventh century, though it is very likely that it was indeed quite long after that time. Since you are also a low church protestant, that means furthermore that your ancestors have only been following a belief that even slightly resembles your own belief for little more than three hundred years. Hardly such a vast and illustrious foundation that you speak of, especially compared to the paternal instincts that you call paganism, which reigned for untold aeons before your cult ever spawned.

Morosis: Okay, well, regardless of the historical timeline, I concede that my own life has not been made perfect, or even improved in any tangible way. In the scriptures we learn that god will often worsen the lives of his closest followers, due to his love. It might not make perfect sense to our worldly minds, but it is better than having no foundation, like the Pagans.

Minos: The reason it does not make sense is because it is obscene and stupid. If your god enacts ferocious tortures against those that he loves, all that proves is that your god is a disgusting and malicious idiot. Mental mutilation is quite a different thing from temperate discipline, even though you would like to equalize them. Imagine someone you love. Can you imagine physically torturing that person to teach them a lesson? Especially in the case that you are fully in control, and are completely capable of teaching them without using torture? If you think the physical and mental horrors that afflict your kind somehow qualify as love, then you are merely a malicious moron just like your fictional god character, and you show only that you love your precious heaven fantasy more than your own race or family. Next argument. Your stupidity has been crushed here.

Morosis: I know that the church has largely been corrupted, I cannot deny that claim. But do you think that any of your objections have not already been answered by saints and theologians over the past two thousand years?

Minos: Once again, you think just because these responses happen to exist, that it means they are good responses. But don't try to lie. I know you still spend many more hours watching questionable videos while you stimulate yourself, and playing video games, than you have reading your own bible, let alone saints and theologians. What you do not realize is that just because some hysterical mongrel from late antiquity managed to mumble out a less than coherent response towards valid objections against christian idiocy, it does not mean that what he had to say was true or good. Not that you would know, as you don't even bother to read what they wrote. In the rare case that you do bother to read anything other than a few lines of jewish scripture, you merely flee to fictions invented only yesterday, George Martin, Cormac McCarthy, and the rest. Since you have not read the early saints, and you never will read them, let me spoil them for you – and reveal to you that they are absolutely incoherent. Nothing spawned in the mind of any gibbering coward regarding Christ has ever come remotely close to what the Pagans of old wrote. If you had put down your video games for more than five minutes and picked up an ancient book written by your own progenitors, you would possibly have realized that.

Morosis: If what you say is true, then I would have to mentally abandon the last two thousand years, and leave it to Pagans with their haughty saviour complexes to fix things. The prospect is highly absurd.

Minos: The last three hundred years, not the last two thousand. I will not remind you again. What I will remind you of, is the fact that you believe that the creator of the entire universe speaks to you directly and clearly. You believe out of all the countless beliefs that have come and gone, that the creator just so happens to approve of the one that is prevalent in your swampy corner of the United States, and that anyone who does not adhere to precisely the same belief as you do, is doomed to eternal torture. Yet you accuse others of being narcissistic, or having a saviour complex? Your solipsism and hypocrisy is repulsive. No group in history has ever possessed a more obnoxious saviour complex than christians. Not to mention the fact that it is christians who have demonstrably been the absolute weakest, and have led your race almost to complete ruin.

Morosis: There are certainly problems of pride within the church, I never said that we were perfect. But we are capable of strength too. For example, we enacted the crusades, and there were many cases throughout history where we persecuted the jews, who have caused so much harm to our race. You must also note that the jews, the original blasphemers against your gods, actually hate Jesus, and are indifferent towards Pagans.

Minos: You have it backwards. The jews despise Pagans, and are indifferent towards christians. The long time authoritative rabbinical doctrine among jews is that while it is idolatrous for jews to be christians, it is actually good for gentiles to be christian or islamic. The religious thinkers who are most beloved by the jews, including the famous rabbi Maimonides, even boast that abrahamic cults were absolutely essential for the consolidation of jewish power. The true jewish struggle is against Europeans holding any healthful beliefs at all. European Pagans were the very first ones targeted for destruction through the spread of jewish cults. The placing of a jewish man as the sole mediator between Europeans and divinity mimics the messianic social order that many rabbinic jews fervently wish to be established today. Regarding the crusades, the Pagans simply did it better, and many times more than what the christians could manage. One Emperor Titus is worth more than one million Peter the Hermits or Martin Luthers. Just two men – Emperor Titus and Emperor Hadrian, did more against the jews than any christian ever did. The conquering actions of these heroic rulers, as well as the acts of numerous other Romans, placed the jews in a tight genetic bottleneck, this being the reason why the jewish phenotype of today is so deformed. Do you really think it's some coincidence that an extremely poisonous and degenerate cult was planted by the jews on European soil at the precise moment when the jews had suffered their most severe defeat at European hands?

Morosis: But this can not be! There is no way our ancestors were so powerful simply because of their bodily strength and mental competence, their power was granted to them only through god!

Minos: You claim to be antisemitic, yet you also claim that the only person who gave your race strength was a jew? I am sorry to be the one to explain this to you, but the power and glory obtained by your progenitors had absolutely nothing to do with a jewish preacher, or his supposedly divine father. Power is from true superiority, open conquest, beauty, and ferocity, which many Europeans still retain even today, despite everything that has happened. If the progenitors of modern Europeans had acted and believed as you do now, there would be none of your race left on earth.

Morosis: Despite the powerful actions of ancient Pagans, modern Pagans are completely degenerate! I know because I have seen it!

Minos: Such obscene hypocrisy. You christians always shudder with fright and clutch your pearls whenever your Pagan friend slips up and says a bad word, yet you never take even half a second to examine your own behavior, five seconds of which is more hideous, disgusting, impudent and obnoxious than anything that you have seen committed by an honest Pagan. If modern Pagan men are just degenerates, then why are so many of them healthy and muscular, with loving wives who don't divorce

them, and who give them healthy children? I could provide you with many examples. Why are christians always ugly, balding, uncanny looking, reclusive and dysgenic people? I thought that god said we would know people by their fruits! It seems only Pagans produce any decent fruit at all. So you have seen about ten cringe-worthy videos of internet Pagans? It means nothing at all. You will find at least one thousand fold that amount of cringe-worthy christian videos. Also realize that the very worst behaviour of christians usually goes unseen. The amount of children raped and traumatized by your beloved priests over the centuries is utterly sickening. You are hardly innocent in this manner as well, as you actively believe in and promote doctrines which warp and mutilate the natural sexual development of young adults, and then you are so stupid as to expect a result other than the complete mangling and perversion of sexual desire among those that hold to christianity most closely – that is usually the priests. Yet here you are, more worried about four silly internet videos instead of the malicious child rapists in your own midst. It is not merely a catholic problem either, it exists almost just as much among protestants and byzantines. To add to this all, you utterly depend on Paganism for so much of your enjoyment. The art, stories, music, aesthetics, video games that you adore, all of them are absolutely saturated in Paganism. They have nothing to do with christ and in fact they imitate who he opposes. It is no wonder why you are so unceasingly hypocritical, when the new testament has nothing beautiful or uplifting within itself, and so you implicitly seek out the aesthetics of Pagans.

Morosis: Do you want to speak of hypocrisy? The Pagans are just as guilty! They blaspheme and say that man cannot be god, yet they deify warriors and emperors of old! Could there be any more clear example of hypocrisy than this?

Minos: There are much more clear examples indeed – and you are one of them. If any mortal is worthy of being called divine, it is the glorious warriors and magnanimous emperors of antiquity, and not your jewish preacher of specious platitudes. Also, the deification of Pagan men only occurs after death, and not while they are still alive, as you obstinately attempt to do with Christ. In addition to this, the divinity attained by Pagans was not as high as the divinity held by Jupiter, Mercury, Venus, and the rest of the gods.

Morosis: Even if that difference is true, the fact still remains that my ancestors abandoned you and the gods you mentioned, and voluntarily went over to christ. They will not be going back any time soon.

Minos: The difference is true, though the fact you mentioned does not remain, but is a lie. Even someone as cognitively confused as you are could agree that if one is compelled by legalistic coercion and outright physical violence to alter their behaviour, then they are most definitely not acting in a voluntary way. Let me provide you with an example that you will be very familiar with. You live your life under a leftist government, which you do not take up arms against. You rarely speak against it openly. You even support it financially through your taxes, without serious protest. You have several family members who vocally support it wholeheartedly. Now tell me – did you choose for any of this to be this way? Did you have a say in it? Or was it made this way by causal factors which began to take their effects long before you were even born? The leftist control over your race is due to the machinations of the weak and malicious, and not your personal choice of any kind. Under your own way of thinking, you are yourself a willing and

complicit leftist, simply because you were born under a regime of leftists who are working tirelessly to force their ways onto their victims, even though you do not actively and vocally support this cabal as you do with christianity .

Morosis: I have heard quite enough, and I will listen to your deception no more! It was prideful and sinful for me to even attempt to reason with demonic powers. The mind is material, and so is the intellect. What is material is the domain of Satan and his fallen angels, and so I must have no part in an intellectual debate, that is – the playground of demons and their deception. Even if you have provided sound and true arguments without fail, there remains one thing which not even the full power of your intellect can destroy – I mean faith, which is immaterial, and comes from god alone.

Minos: Do you understand that by rejecting the intellect, your sanity and argumentative ability becomes no greater than that of the average leftist that you claim to be opposed to? But of course, you no longer seek to engage intellectually, and wish to operate on faith alone. Unfortunately for you, I can prove that what you call your faith is not only itself material, but that it is even more fallible than your attempts at debate.

Morosis: Are you going to unleash that three headed monster against me? Because if so, I know that christ will protect me from it's attacks.

Minos: Cerberus is not going to attack you, though rest assured that if he did christ would not help you.

Morosis: Then what are you going to do?

Minos: I can prove through your own actions that you do not even love your own god, and that your faith is not what you think or say that it is.

Morosis: Nothing can defeat my faith.

Minos: Have you ever read the tenth chapter of the book of Hebrews in the new testament?

Morosis: I have, not recently, but I did read that book.

Minos: Then you will recognize these words – “If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left, but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of

raging fire that will consume the enemies of God.” You must also recall the words Jesus spoke in the gospel of John – “If you love me, keep my commands.”

Morosis: What are you saying?

Minos: Well, I have just shown you that you do not love Jesus, nor do you love the truth, and your faith is not in either of them at all. We both know that there was one sin, which you were always aware of, and which you deliberately engaged in constantly. You sexually stimulated yourself to images on a screen until the day you died. You never stopped it, you never even came close to stopping it, and thusly you have shown that you care nothing for Jesus. If you did love him, you would’ve kept his commands. Those are his words, and not mine. You have proven through your own actions that your faith is only in your hedonism, and that what you actually worship is pleasure and idleness. You cling to Jesus because he promised you eternal pleasure at no cost. You are the ultimate hedonist. If your faith truly came from your love of Christ, you would not have continued to commit the exact same sin over and over again, more consistently than clockwork. But you do not love christ, or truth, or your race. You betray your faith and blaspheme your god more regularly than any Pagan you have known. Jesus himself said that you do not love him, if the words of the scriptures are true, as you believe them to be. The actual truth is that you love video games, you love comfort, and you love your fantasy of heaven and the complacency that comes with it. You have proved all of this.

Morosis utterly breaks down, he wails and laments in pure denial and terror

Minos: How annoying that they always act like this, so embarrassing and uncontained. They fall apart and weep in an effeminate display of fear and weakness, just as they did in life, during the few fleeting moments in which they managed to scrounge up any enjoyment or peace of mind as christians, during their futile prayers, that is. Cease your obnoxious lamentations!

Morosis: What will happen to me now? Will I be punished harshly?

Minos: No, though I shall judge you. I, unlike your fake god, am indeed a merciful judge. In life, your most consistent defect was cowardice. This flaw has become all too common since the time of Christ, though that age is gradually coming to an end, and soon enough our cosmos will enter the reign of noble Aquarius. Regarding Christ and his closest followers, the old saints and emperors, they remain here for now. Since they were in life such fervent promoters of hard labour, they now labour and toil on a massive castle here, which they have been forced to keep building in order to contain all of those who maliciously deceived in their names, who will all be imprisoned there until the last traces of christianity finally disappear from the earth. Their work will only end and crumble away once the cult they founded also ends, which it eventually will, as swiftly as it first appeared. Then, their souls will finally be released. But until that time, they remain in their strenuous work, and whenever they get even slightly out of line, the watchful Eumenides are always there to give them a well deserved and ferocious lashing. But have no

fear. Since you were not particularly malicious, but comparatively a foolish and common coward, you will not be joining christ and his saints among their toil. You will now go to the plain of Lethe, where you will drink from the river Lethe, the waters of which will erase your memories, and your faith finally will disappear forever then, if you have not lost it already. After a time of waiting among the rest of the ghosts in the plain, your soul will then be reincarnated, thus returning to the world that you once renounced in life.

Morosis: This cannot be...

The grand porphyry gates behind Minos open, emanating a gentle blue light from beyond. Out of this light two physically impressive figures emerge. They are two winged immortal men, dressed in resplendent armour, each holding an upside down torch, and radiant with youthful beauty. Their aquiline faces are complimented by the thick and wavy fair hair on their heads, and their eyes are alive with blue wisdom. One hovers to the left of Minos, and one hovers to his right. They are both calm and tranquil

Morosis: My god... Perhaps my faith has been true... No orator, no poet that has yet lived could possibly describe the beauty and serenity of these two which have now emerged. Are you angels? Have you come to vindicate my faith and reprimand the one who accuses me?

Minos: These two which stand here are not angels. On my right is Hypnos, and on my left, Thanatos. Sleep, and Death. They are some of the most feared enemies of christianity, and they are here to take you to the plain of Lethe now.

Morosis: So I see... There is nothing left for me to say.

Hypnos and Thanatos glide softly over to Morosis. They lift him up, and fly him away, through the serene blue vortex within the great threshold behind Minos and his throne